

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 114

HE 003 274

AUTHOR Trow, Martin
 TITLE Technical Report: Carnegie Commission National Survey of Higher Education.
 INSTITUTION Carnegie Commission on Higher Education , Berkeley, Calif.
 SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
 REPORT NO CCHE-TR-7
 BUREAU NO BR 9-0148
 PUB DATE 1 Jun 72
 GRANT OEG-0-9-140148-4457(010)
 NOTE 132p.
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58
 DESCRIPTORS *Educational Development; *Educational Planning; *Educational Research; *Higher Education; Questionnaires; *School Surveys; Surveys

ABSTRACT

This document presents the report of a study designed to (1) gather information and develop ideas useful to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in making recommendations on public policy; and (2) investigate and illuminate aspects of American higher education of interest to a wide audience of social scientists, faculty, and administrators. The information presented within the report was gathered by means of a questionnaire that was administered to faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students in 2,300 colleges and universities throughout the U. S. A fourth study, smaller in sample size than the other 3, conducted of professional researchers in the largest universities of the sample. The data are presented primarily in tabular form with descriptions and discussions accompanying the tables. (HS)

ED 066774

TECHNICAL REPORT

Copy #7

RECD
HE

National Survey of Higher Education

Dr. Martin A. Trow, Project Director

Grant no. OEG-0-9-140148-4457 (010)

Project no. 9-0148

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 003 274

ED 066114

BR 9-0148
PA 24

TECHNICAL REPORT: CARNEGIE COMMISSION
NATIONAL SURVEY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

June 1, 1972

Martin Trow, Director

Professional Staff:

Joseph Zelan, Associate Research Sociologist
Travis Hirschi, Associate Research Sociologist
Stephen Steinberg, Post Graduate Research Sociologist
Saul Feldman, Junior Specialist
Ted Bradshaw, Post Graduate Research Sociologist
Oliver Fulton, Post Graduate Research Sociologist
Carlos Kruytbosch, Post Graduate Research Sociologist
Judy Roizen, Post Graduate Research Sociologist
Sandra Meyers, Post Graduate Research Sociologist
Lynne Alexander, Administrative Assistant
Glenn Edwards, Administrative Assistant
Don Trummell, Programmer
Richard Scheffer, Project Coordinator

~~Handwritten scribble~~

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Design and Method	1
The Survey of Faculty Members	2
The Survey of Graduate Students	3
The Survey of Undergraduates	3
The Survey of Professional Researchers	4
II. DECEMBER 1, 1967 to FEBRUARY 1, 1969	5
The Sample of Institutions	5
Faculty and Graduate Students	5
Undergraduates	9
Professional Research Personnel	14
The Enumeration	16
Faculty and Graduate Students	16
Undergraduates	18
Professional Research Personnel	20
Questionnaire Development	22
III. FEBRUARY 1, 1969 to MARCH 1, 1970	23
Data Collection	23
Faculty and Graduate Students	23
Undergraduates and Professional Research Personnel	24
Data Utilization Activities	25
Protection of Respondents' Anonymity	25
Quality Control of Data	25
Study of Response Bias	26
Development of an Institutional File	27
IV. MARCH 1, 1970 to JANUARY 1, 1971	28
Weighting	29
Faculty and Graduate	29
Undergraduate	39

Table of Contents (cont'd.)

IV. MARCH 1, 1970 to JANUARY 1, 1971 (cont'd.)

Nonresponse Bias	49
Faculty	49
Graduates	60
Undergraduates	73
Quality Ranking of Institutions	91
Universities	91
Four-Year Colleges	94
List of American Universities and Colleges by Quality Ranking	97
Quality I Institutions	97
Quality II Institutions	98
Quality III Institutions	100
Quality IV Institutions	102
Quality V Institutions	104
Quality VI Institutions	107
Quality VII Institutions	117

TABLES

<u>Table #</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	ACE Sample Institutions through 1968 and Responses to 1968-69 Solicitation for Faculty and Graduate Student Lists	10
2	Participating Institutions and Individuals	18
3	Faculty and Graduate Participation in Followup Study	24
4A	Assignment of Institutions to 1966 ACE Cells with Faculty Institutional Weights	30
4B	Assignment of Institutions to 1966 ACE Cells with Graduate Student Institutional Weights	31
5	Actual Population of Graduate Students in Quality Strata and Number of Graduate Students Estimated from 1966 ACE Cells	34
6	Correction Factors for Quality and Control Bias in 1966 ACE Sample -- Faculty and Graduate Students	35
7	Distribution of Final Weights Adjusted for Quality, Control, and Nonresponse -- Faculty and Graduate Students	38
8	Undergraduate Enrollment Data	39
9	Strata Weights	42
10	Adjustment Factors	43
11	Range of Final Weights by Year	44
12	Verification of Weights by Control	46
13	Verification of Weights by Type and Quality	46
14	Verification of Weighting Cells	47
15A	Distribution of Sex in the Achieved and Criterion Sample (Faculty)	51
15B	Distribution of Quality in the Achieved and Criterion Samples (Faculty)	52
16	Distributions of Selected Characteristics in the Achieved Sample and the Criterion Sample (Faculty)	52
17	Faculty -- Interests Primarily in Research or Teaching	55
18	Faculty -- Percent with Interests Heavily in Teaching by Quality of Institution	55
19	Political Self-Identification (Faculty)	56

TABLES (cont'd.)

<u>Table #</u>		<u>Page</u>
20A	Rank by Quality of Institution Faculty-Achieved Sample	58
20B	Rank by Quality of Institution Faculty-Criterion Sample	59
21A	Date of Birth by Quality of Institution Faculty-Achieved Sample	59.
21B	Date of Birth by Quality of Institution Faculty-Criterion Sample	60
22A	Distribution of Quality in the Achieved and Criterion Samples (Graduate)	62
22B	Distribution of Sex in the Achieved and Criterion Samples (Graduate)	62
23	Distributions of Selected Characteristics in the Achieved Sample and the Criterion Sample (Graduate)	
A	In What Year Did You First Enter Graduate School?	64
B	Highest Degree Working for	65
C	When Do You Expect to Get the Degree You Are Now Working for?	66
D	Department in Which You Are Studying	67
24	Employment Status in the Achieved and Criterion Samples (Graduate)	68
25	Political Self-Identification (Graduate)	68
26A	Political Identification by Quality of Institution (Achieved Sample)	69
26B	Political Identification by Quality of Institution (Criterion Sample)	70
27A	Age by Quality of Institution (Achieved Sample)	71
27B	Age by Quality of Institution (Criterion Sample)	72
28	Response Rates by Year Entered College as a Freshman	75
29	Measure of Socio-Economic Status of Undergraduates	77
A	Father's Educational Attainment	77
B	Mother's Educational Attainment	77
C	Total Family Income	78
D	Race	79
30	Sex	80

TABLES (cont'd)

<u>Table #</u>		<u>Page</u>
31	Quality of Entering Institution	82
32A	High School Grade Point Average	84
32B	Highest Degree Intend to Obtain	84
33	Control of Institution: Public/ Private	85
34	Intended Major Field	86
35	Final Weighted Distributions	89
A	Quality of Entering Institution (Criterion and Achieved Samples)	89
B	High School Grade Point Average (Criterion and Achieved Samples)	89
C	Sex (Criterion and Achieved Samples)	90

I

This report derives from a questionnaire survey of faculty, graduate students and undergraduates conducted by the Carnegie Commission's National Survey of Higher Education in the Spring and Fall of 1969. In broad outline, the study comprises three major sample surveys in the 2,300 institutions of higher learning in the United States: one of faculty members, a second of graduate students and a third of undergraduates. A fourth study, smaller in sample size than the other three was conducted of professional researchers in the largest universities in our sample.

This study has two general purposes: to gather information and develop ideas useful to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in making recommendations on public policy; and to investigate and illuminate aspects of American higher education of interest to a wide audience of social scientists, faculty, and administrators.

Design and Method

The faculty and graduate student surveys were done in cooperation with the Office of Research of the American Council on Education; the survey of undergraduates was done collaboratively with them. Since 1966 ACE has been conducting surveys of new students in a national sample of over 300 institutions of higher education, representative of all types of American colleges and universities, two and four year, public and private. The data they have collected and the procedures developed for

gathering and processing survey data were helpful in carrying out the present study.

The ACE sample institutions were selected by a stratified probability method. This sample was used with some modifications, for the three major surveys. All four surveys used mail questionnaire forms. Detailed enumerations were carried out for the faculty, graduate students and professional reseachers.

The Survey of Faculty Members

Some 461,000 full- and part-time faculty members serve in over 2,300 American colleges and universities. In 1967, the institutions in the ACE sample employed about 115,000 faculty members. The decision to conduct a census of this population was based on several considerations:

1. Most colleges are small: to sample their faculty would produce too few cases to allow us to represent either the faculty as a whole or its major segments.
2. Relatively large numbers of responses allow much finer analyses of specific categories of faculty than would otherwise be possible.

The population to be studied was to include all people, other than graduate teaching assistants, actually carrying the burden of instruction in these institutions at the time the survey was administered.

The Survey of Graduate Students

In 1967 the ACE sample institutions enrolled approximately 370,000 students beyond the baccalaureate level, the great majority enrolled in the 90 universities in the sample. Nearly 40,000 however, were enrolled in what are predominantly four year institutions, most of them concentrated in some 60 of the larger "four year" colleges.

This survey was to include 50,000 graduate students sampled randomly from the fall lists of graduate students in the ACE institutions.

The aim was to sample students in all graduate fields and professional schools in ways that allow the preparation, through appropriate weighting, of estimates describing the population of graduate students in American colleges and universities.

The Survey of Undergraduates

During the fall of 1969 there were approximately 6,000,000¹ undergraduate students in accredited colleges in the United States. The institutions in the undergraduate sample enrolled about 750,000 of these students.

The undergraduate survey utilizes a sample of those students who responded to the American Council of Education ongoing research of first time students during the fall terms 1966-1969 inclusive. This sample design provided the benefit of panel data for all respondents and easy access to student names and addresses, though it failed to reach those students in sample institutions who first entered college more than

1. Estimate, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1969 edition, p. 2, Digest of Educational Statistics, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education (September, 1969).

four years earlier and those students who transferred into a sample institution after first enrolling in another institution. However, the survey did include those who dropped out or transferred from a sample institution after entering during these 4 terms.

The undergraduate sample was designed to include approximately 200,000 students. These students were sampled from the respondents to the ACE freshman surveys in a manner which insured representation from each initial cohort in each institution sufficient to provide reliable data on the student body as a whole and on its major segments, as the other surveys aimed to do. These sampling goals were achieved by eliminating from the original sample of 310 institutions those which had not participated during all of the years 1966-69, those with poor response rates to the ACE freshman questionnaires, and those with inadequate student name and address files. This reduced the institutional sample to 189. Then, up to 1,000 students were selected from each institution, distributed by their entrance cohort.

Survey of Professional Researchers

The study of professional researchers is aimed at those researchers employed in the largest "federal-grant" universities. Unlike the other major surveys the aim is not to include a representative sample of institutions. Data from various sources indicate that research personnel make up 20 to 33 percent of the academic staffs of graduate degree granting institutions with the proportions rising to over 50 percent in a few major universities. But Office of Education figures (Faculty and Other Professional Staff in Institutions of Higher Education, 1963-64) indicate that 31 institutions employed 61 percent of all "non faculty" researchers. Twenty-two of the top 31 employers of research personnel are ACE sample institutions.

The aim of the survey was to do a census of researchers in these institutions, attempting to reach some 10,000 researchers.

II

Work on the surveys began December 1, 1967. During the first period of the study, December 1, 1967 to February 1, 1969, all of the planning, determination of basic sample design, the enumeration of faculty and graduate students, and the development of questionnaires for all the studies except the undergraduates was completed. This stage was funded entirely by the Carnegie Commission.

A major effort during this period was gathering ACE individual and institutional data from prior years for preliminary analysis. Also data was obtained from the Bureau of Applied Social Research and the Office of Education for use in preliminary analysis and later in the preparation of final data.

The decision to use the ACE sample of institutions was made at this time and preliminary letters were sent to ACE institutional representatives.

The Sample of Institutions

Faculty and Graduate Students

Every sample represents a compromise among different and to some degree incompatible research interests. For example, insofar as we wish to generalize our findings to all (or nearly all) of American higher education, we want a broadly representative sample of all the kinds of institutions that make it up. Insofar as we want to write in more detail

about a specific kind of institution--say, the public junior colleges--not only is a representative sample of those institutions needed, but one large enough to reveal the diversity within a category that appears homogeneous only to those who do not know it.

The ACE sample draws on the whole universe of American higher education, omitting only those institutions which have been created since the 1965-66 Education Directory, Part 3 was prepared, and those which have grown into "eligibility" (having a freshman class of at least 30) since that time. The sampling design provides adequate samples of students and faculty in all sizes of institutions, and in most categories of institutions. The advantages of using the ACE sample rather than designing and drawing a new sample were felt to outweigh any marginal gains that a new sample might allow.

1. Use of the ACE sample affords us access to some 300 institutions with whom the ACE has a continuing research relationship and established procedures for gathering data.
2. Using the ACE sample of institutions presents us with a very large amount of information about the sample institutions and their student bodies.
3. For the undergraduates, panel data is available for individuals who entered and continued in the sample institutions.
4. The ACE procedures provide our own survey with a means of reaching with our own questionnaire those who entered the sample institutions during given years. This would otherwise be a serious problem, since many institutions have no records of the home addresses of their students.

5. The ACE data in addition, allows us to identify and study the special characteristics of drop-outs, as well as those who transfer, looking also at the characteristic patterns of inter-institutional mobility and of discontinuous college careers.

In 1966, 1,968 institutions were eligible for the ACE sample.

These institutions were stratified by institutional type (2-year colleges, 4-year colleges, universities),² size of enrollment (2-year colleges only), and per-student expenditures³ (4-year colleges and universities only). ACE deliberately oversampled universities and institutions in upper-end categories of enrollment and affluence, eventually inviting 371 institutions to participate in their research program (ACE Research Report, 1:1, 1966, p. 12). The actual selection of sample institutions is described by ACE:

The institutions were initially sorted into the appropriate stratification cells, the cell members shuffled, and 371 institutions randomly chosen for the contact sample . . . The only departure from strict randomness was the deliberate inclusion in the 371 of 61 institutions that had been selected from a similar stratification design for (a) 1965 pilot study . . . An additional 25 institution, not

2. ACE follows the definition of institutional type used by the Office of Education. This definition is discussed in the section on institutional quality of ranking.

3. This measure of affluence is the per student expenditure for "educational and general" purposes.

included as part of the sample, were also selected either by their own request or because they were known to have educational programs of some special interest to the research staff (1:1, 1966, p. 11-12).⁴

Of the 371 institutions selected, 307⁵ agreed to participate in the research program (85% of the 4-year and 60% of the 2-year institutions.)

The Carnegie enumeration began in the fall of 1968. The 1966 sample had changed in several ways by 1968:⁶

25 institutions dropped out of the research program; 2 institutions moved from the university to the college category, 4 colleges became universities and 2 institutions disappeared as separate entities as a result of

4. The institutions mentioned by ACE are those remaining in the pilot study sample of the 71 initially chosen. Of this 71, 36 institutions were selected randomly and 35 "primarily because their presidents had recently been active in various committees or commissions of the Council." (Alexander W. Astin and Robert J. Panos, "A National Research Data Bank for Higher Education," *Educational Record*, Winter, 1966, pp. 5-17.) Although the rate of participation in the pilot study would presumably be higher among these selected at least partly on the basis of anticipated cooperation, ACE notes that "there was no significant difference between the samples of 36 and 35 institutions in rate of agreement to participate." (p.12) In the final pilot study sample, "very poor, relatively small institutions of moderate size, and relatively wealthy large institutions" are substantially overrepresented. As will be evident subsequently, these biases carry over to some extent into the final ACE sample selected in 1966.

5. The sample used by ACE in 1968 was modified considerably over the 1966 sample. 135 institutions were added to the total sample and the entire sample was restratified using criteria other than those used in 1966. In order to preserve the panel, Carnegie chose to use the 1966 sample with modifications made necessary by changes in institutions from 1966 to 1968.

6. ACE reported in 1966 that 295 institutions agreed to cooperate. Subsequent descriptions of the 1966 sample list 307 institutions. It appears in fact that 309 participated, but two were not included in the published 1966 National Norms.

consolidation. In 1967, 24 additional junior colleges were added to the ACE sample due to an undersampling of junior colleges and the relatively high rate of withdrawal of junior colleges. Late in the enumeration the 24 junior colleges were added to the Carnegie sample. (see Table 1)

As Table 1 shows the response of the institutions in the ACE sample to the 1968 request for faculty and graduate student lists was excellent. Only 7 of the 310 institutions included in the sample at that time did not participate in the faculty survey-- and this in most cases was due to circumstances beyond their control. Although the number of 4-year colleges failing to participate in the graduate survey appears to be quite large, in fact only a small number of graduate students are enrolled in non-participating institutions (see Table 1, Note h).

Undergraduates

Several considerations led to a reduction of the institutional sample for the undergraduate survey from 310 institutions to 189.

1) Four-year colleges and universities which had not participated in the ACE freshman studies during the years 1966-1969 were eliminated. Two-year institutions which had not participated in both of the years 1966 and 1967 were eliminated. This was done to assure that for each of the sample institutions there would be panel data available for all respondents and that there would be adequate representation of students at all stages of their college careers.

Table 1

ACE Sample Institutions through 1968 and Responses to 1968-69
Solicitation for Faculty and Graduate Student Lists

	ACE '66 Sample	Dropped Out ^g	Reclassified		Added ^d	Total Solicited	Faculty Lists		Graduate Lists		
			In ^b	Out ^b (Out) ^c			Sent	Not Sent	Sent	Not Sent	
Universities	91	13	2	4	0	1	80	0	79	1 ⁱ	
4-Year Colleges with Graduate Students											
	183	9	4	2	2	3	104	1 ^f	78	26 ^h	
4-Year Colleges Without Graduate Students											
							82	0	1 ^h	75	
Junior Colleges	35	10	0	0	0	24	59	44	0	50	
						(1967)					
Total	309 ^a	25	6	6	2	28	337	303	7	158	152

(1967)

a. The ACE 1966 "National Norms" list is said to be based on 307 institutions. It appears however that two extra institutions in fact surveyed in 1966 and included in the ACE panel from 1967 on.

b. The current OE/ACE classification of six institutions differs from ACE's 1966 National Norms listing. Four institutions are newly classified by OE as colleges; two are now classified as universities.

Notes for Table 1 con't

- c. One institution was dropped when its lists were grouped with a neighboring and affiliated institution. The other was dropped when two institutions formally merged.

- d. These additions are institutions not part of the 1966 ACE sample. Because of an undersampling of junior colleges in 1966 and because of the relatively high rate of withdrawal of junior colleges from the ACE panel (see Note G) it was decided in early January 1969 to request faculty lists from an additional 24 junior colleges, all of which had been added to the ACE panel in 1967. Because of the limited time available, five of these additional 24 were unable to send faculty lists before the questionnaire mailing data. This accounts for five of the six junior college non-responses (see Note E).
It appears that one University was accidentally asked for lists because of an error in ACE's mailing list.

- e. Five junior colleges were unable to provide faculty lists in time (see note D): one withdrew from the whole ACE panel after the mailing requesting lists was made.

- f. The faculty lists from another college appear to have been lost at an early stage in processing. It is classed as "not sent", although strictly speaking the list that was sent was simply not sampled.

- g. Thirteen universities withdrew from the ACE 1966 panel between 1966 and late fall 1968. Three of these were persuaded by the Commission to send faculty and graduate lists for the Carnegie surveys. Nine four-year colleges withdrew (one as a result of closure); three of these sent lists. Ten two-year colleges withdrew before the first mailing, of which one sent a faculty list. Another college withdrew after the first mailing (see note E).

- h. All of these four-year colleges sent faculty lists (see Note F). According to Office of Education figures, they enroll a total of 7,219 graduate students, with three institutions accounting for 66% of these. The largest college in terms of graduate enrollment, which accounts for 44% of the missing students, agreed to send a graduate student list, which did not arrive in time for the mailing of questionnaires. Several of the schools the Office of Education shows as having a small number of graduate students informed us that in fact no graduate students were enrolled at the time of the 1968 survey. Conversely, one college listed by OE as having no graduate students sent us a short list.
- i. Owing to difficulties attendant on its consolidation, one institution (see note C) was unable to supply us with graduate student lists.

2) Some institutions in the ACE freshman surveys had achieved poor response rates or had distributed questionnaires in a non-systematic manner. Those institutions which, according to information provided by ACE, had achieved a response rate of less than 85% or had distributed questionnaires in a manner which was questionable (e.g., distribution at voluntary freshman orientation meetings), during any of the years 1966-1968 were excluded. Information for the ACE 1969 freshman survey was not yet available at the time of sampling for the present survey.

3) Steps 2 and 3 left 195 institutions available for the study. Six more institutions were eliminated when the name and address files delivered to National Computer Systems for mailing were discovered to be lacking either names or addresses or both for a majority of the students.

The above steps resulted in an institutional sample size of 189. These were accepted as the institutions from which the sample of four cohorts of entering students would be selected. The number and range of institutions was sufficient for our purpose of characterizing the entire range of American colleges and universities and the sampling of approximately 1,000 students from each institution would keep us within our intended sample size of approximately 2,000,000.

Professional Research Personnel

Like federal research dollars, researchers, whose principal source of support is grants and contracts, are concentrated in relatively few institutions of higher education in the United States. According to the Office of Education survey of Faculty and Other Professional Staff in Institutions of Higher Education, 1963-64, of 1431 institutions, 31 employed 61% of all researchers. Seventeen of these had complements of more than 1,000 researchers each. The remaining 14 institutions employed between 500 and 1,000 researchers each. Comparison of the Office of Education figures with a series of figures published annually in the journal Industrial Research showed quite a wide variation in the figures for each institution. On the grounds that any attempt to get at the total distribution of researchers at all institutions would be based on unreliable figures, it was decided to focus only on institutions employing large complements of researchers. A principal consideration in this decision was the cost of visiting such institutions and the relatively large number of institutions that would have had to be sampled to provide sufficient respondents.

The decision having been made to look only at institutions with large complements of researchers, the second constraint upon the sample was that it be included in the ACE sample.⁷ Of the 17 institutions listed by OE survey as having more than one thousand researchers

7. Some of the major universities employing over 750 researchers were not included in the ACE sample.

each, 14 were included in the ACE sample. Of the 14 institutions reported by OE as employing between 500 and 1,000 researchers each, nine were included in the ACE sample. In all, the ACE sample included 23 of the top 31 employers of research personnel as of 1963-64.

Of the institutions that dropped out of the ACE sample three were major research-employing institutions. As substitutes for these, three institutions were selected from the ACE sample that employ between 300 and 500 researchers. The combined total of researcher employment, as recorded by the Office of Education, at the institutions dropped was 4,000 and the combined total of researchers at the three added institutions was approximately 1,000.

The total number of researchers reported by OE for the institutions in the researcher sample was about 21,000. By using a "narrow" definition of researcher the number of full-fledged research personnel was cut by half.

Although this reduces research personnel considerably for most of the institutions, researchers defined in this manner represent the core group closest to the regular faculty in research qualifications and academic orientation.

Thus, it was estimated that the 23 institutions would yield approximately 10,000 researchers as defined in the narrow sense. In fact, the number ended up at approximately 7,300.

The Enumeration

Faculty and Graduate Students

Since ACE had not heretofore studied graduate students, faculty or professional researchers, an enumeration of the relevant populations was necessary.

Requests for lists of faculty members were sent first to the ACE Representative on the participating campuses in the Fall of 1968. In many cases someone other than the Representative assisted in the preparation of the lists. The request specified that the faculty list include:

A list of the names and departmental addresses of the regular faculty of the academic departments and professional schools of your institution. This list should include any staff member who is in charge of courses: including visiting professors, visiting lecturers, and any lecturers, instructors, etc. whether "acting" or not, who are responsible for the teaching of any course during the '68-'69 academic year creditable towards a degree (associate, bachelors, or higher). If possible, this list should not include graduate students acting as teaching assistants. If any question arises as to whether or not to include an individual, please include him.

The faculty study thus included all people other than graduate teaching assistants, giving regular courses. The population includes both visitors and part-time faculty. It also includes a small number of senior administrators who are ordinarily recruited from the ranks of academic men and whose work bears directly on the academic program. Other administrators and non-teaching personnel were removed from faculty lists whenever possible. Some clinical professors of law and engineering were excluded where they did not seem to constitute "regular faculty." But when ambiguous, the lists were inclusive rather than exclusive.

Names and local addresses of graduate students were gathered for all institutions in the ACE sample. Each sample institution was asked for

A list of names and local, but not departmental, addresses of graduate and professional students enrolled in the departments and schools of your institution in degree programs beyond the undergraduate bachelor's degree. If the student is not in residence and does not have a local address, a home address would be appreciated. In order that we may arrive, for our own definitional purposes, at an accurate description of the kinds of students included in our sample, we would appreciate your attaching a note of the sources you have used to obtain these lists.

Computer print out and data card lists sent by sample schools were presumed to include appropriate faculty and graduate students as defined in the request letter. When faculty directories were sent, only "regular faculty not on leave" were enumerated. Professional schools were included if they did not constitute separate campuses. Branch or satellite campuses were included although lists for these campuses were less complete than for main campuses.

The graduate student lists were treated, for the purposes of enumeration and sampling, as one continuous list. To reduce processing costs three in every four names were eliminated from the graduate list during the enumeration. This list was then sampled. A final one-sixth sample was obtained by removing one third of the cases from the remaining cases. The first procedure involved a systematic sample with a random start, the second a random sample with a random start.

Although the intention was to do a census of the faculty, a 6 in 7 sample was drawn from the final faculty lists to reduce costs.

The enumeration indicated that 116,115 faculty members were employed in the participating sample institutions and that 310,088 graduate students were enrolled in the graduate institutions. (See Table 2.)

Table 2

	Number of Parti- cipating Institu- tions.	Total Faculty & Grads. in Parti- cipating Insti.	Enumerated Faculty & Graduates	Number of Ques- tionnaires sent after final sampling
Faculty	303	116,115	116,115*	100,290
Graduates	158	310,088	77,522*	51,682

* All faculty and one fourth of the graduate students were enumerated; the final samples included 6/7 of the listed faculty and 2/3 of the listed graduate students.

Undergraduates

Instead of enumerating all the undergraduates in the 189 undergraduate sample institutions, we drew the sample of individuals from among the respondents to the ACE freshman surveys in those institutions. Respondents to the ACE surveys had been asked to give a "permanent" address at which they could be reached. ACE was instructed by us to sample these names and addresses randomly within cohorts in a manner to attain a maximum number of individuals per institution of 1,000, distributed among the 4 cohorts as follows:

1966	Freshman Cohort	300
1967	Freshman Cohort	275
1968	Freshman Cohort	225
1969	Freshman Cohort	200
Total		1,000

When a cohort for an institution totaled fewer than the assigned maximum, all the students in that cohort were to be selected.

These maximum cohort sizes were chosen so as to insure that a sufficient absolute number of respondents would be available for each cohort, since response rates were expected to be inversely related to the time elapsed since the individual's address had been acquired. The differential sampling rates were to be adjusted by weighting.

Questionnaires were mailed just prior to Christmas, 1969, with the aim of reaching the sampled individuals at their homes during the Christmas recess.

Upon receiving the complete data files for all sampled individuals, whether they had responded or not (non-respondents were represented only by ACE freshman data), we discovered that ACE had not adhered to the sampling quotas which we had established for each cohort. As far as we were able to determine, these quotas had been exceeded in all institutions which had more students than the maximum specified by our quotas. The largest discrepancy was 50% over the specified quota. Examination of the actual number of students sampled per cohort per institution indicates that the discrepancy between our instructions and the actual number of cases sampled was probably due to an error in the computer program for sampling the institutional files, which resulted in a higher rate per institution than had been intended. This is in no way serious, since our weighting procedures necessitate weighting by institution prior to making any other adjustments.

Professional Research Personnel

The criteria used to define researchers in the Office of Education and Industrial Research studies must be interpreted in a "broad" sense to include, in addition to "full-fledged" researchers, many personnel having auxiliary or trainee status. For the purpose of this study, the following definition of researchers was used:

'Persons appointed to perform research in positions other than regular "ladder" faculty positions, who are capable of independent research, or scholarly work as evidenced by their possession of the Ph.D. degree or equivalent research accomplishment.'

Site visits were made to all but one of the 23 institutions in the researcher sample. Interviews were conducted with academic and other administrative personnel with a view to determining the best mode of

identifying and collecting names and departmental addresses of persons in non-faculty research positions. Four sources of such information were eventually used - some of them exclusively for some institutions, and for other institutions, combinations of these sources were used. The sources were: printout from payroll tapes; printouts or listings from records in personnel offices; listings assembled from academic catalogs; and finally, in one institution, listings from the campus telephone book. The initial period of the enumeration was thus carried out by gaining the cooperation of administrative or research personnel in order to identify those researchers necessary to this study. Although in most cases information was easily obtained, some bias in the sample remains.

The most serious bias in the types of researchers that were enumerated is an undercount of the kind of post doctoral fellows who come, particularly to the large universities, without any formal appointment (often necessitated by receiving a paycheck through the payroll system and who essentially bring their fellowship money with them). It is safe to say that none of the large institutions had any regular administrative methods for keeping tabs on such people. The magnitude of the group thus missed may range up to 20% or so of the total at some institutions. Richard Curtis' study of "Post-doctoral Education in the United States" conducted by the National Science Foundation provides some clue as to the magnitude of this bias. The 1967 study identified some 13,300 post doctoral appointments in universities, 25% of which were individuals on true nationally competitive fellowships; the others being hired on various titles on project funds or as trainees. Institutions seem to

vary randomly in the extent which they press for appointing all their research personnel to research associated type (i.e., staff) appointments or the extent to which they are willing to lend the titles "fellow" to these people.

Questionnaire Development

During the fall of 1968 work on Questionnaire development was completed for the faculty and graduate studies and pre-testing was begun. Because the questionnaires were to be machine readable, exacting care with the lay-out had to be taken as well as concern with substantive issues. Although there is some small random error in the use of an optical scanner to read this type of document, it is more accurate and economical than any other method of large scale data collection.⁸ Four versions of each questionnaire were ultimately constructed. Pre-testing was carried out on the two final versions. Pre-testing was somewhat limited because it was impossible to produce an interim machine-readable questionnaire. Most of the pre-testing was done, therefore, by interview.

8. The error is estimated at less than one half of one percent.

III

The second major period of work, 2/1/69 to 3/1/70 covers the completion of the enumeration of individuals in the sample for all the surveys, the mailing of the questionnaires, and limited preliminary analyses of data from all but the undergraduate survey. The work for this period was funded by the Office of Education and the Carnegie Commission. The Office of Education funds were used primarily for data collection, computer costs and the intensive follow-up of non-respondents. The initial grant was awarded February 1, 1969 to run for one year.

Data CollectionFaculty and Graduate Students

Printing and mailing of the questionnaires for the four major studies was handled through National Computer Systems, Minneapolis, Minn. The lay-out and printing of the faculty and graduate questionnaires was accomplished during the early spring, 1969. Name and address files were given to NCS and great care was taken to insure the anonymity of all respondents. Faculty questionnaires were mailed the second week of March over a period of five days. Graduate questionnaires were mailed the third week of March in three days. Follow-up postcards were mailed out approximately a week after the mailing of the questionnaires.

Considerable effort was taken to assure the highest possible response rate. Two weeks after the mailing of the postcards a follow-up letter was sent to all non-respondents. Six weeks after the original mailing a second questionnaire was sent to the remaining non-respondents

(See Table 3). As Table 3 indicates most people responded to the initial questionnaire. Sixteen-hundred and fifty faculty members responded to the follow-up letter and an additional 5,778 individuals responded after receiving the second questionnaire. Thirteen hundred and fifty (1350) graduate students responded after the follow-up letter, 3,091 after receiving a second questionnaire. Slightly more than 8% of the faculty and graduate samples responded as a result of the three additional mailings.

Table 3

Faculty and Graduate Participation in Followup Study

	Number of Follow-up Postcards Sent	Number of Respon- dents Receiving Follow-up Letters	Number of Respon- dents Receiving 2nd Questionnaire	Total Returned Questionnaires
Faculty	100,290	47,580	45,930	60,028
Graduates	51,682	23,160	21,810	32,963

Undergraduates and Professional Research Personnel

Questionnaires were mailed to the researchers a little over a month after the original faculty and graduate mailings. Most of the respondents had returned their questionnaires by the first week in June, but follow-up letters were mailed to the non-respondents the second week in July to increase the response. Out of the 7300 researchers sampled, we received 3729 useable questionnaires for a response rate of 51%.

The layout and printing of the undergraduate questionnaire was completed in November 1969. The questionnaires were mailed out a month later to reach the students during the Christmas recess. Follow-up post cards urging the completion of the questionnaire were mailed out a week later to everyone

in the 171,525 undergraduate sample. By our cutoff date we had received 70,772 useable questionnaires for a response rate of 41% (by cohort: 1966-38%; 1967-39%; 1968-44%; 1969-46%).

Data Utilization Activities

Protection of Respondents' Anonymity

This was accomplished by removing from the master tape the links between the names of the respondents and their addresses and the serial numbers used for analytical identification. The names were wholly obliterated, preventing any inadvertant disclosure of the responses of individuals. In the case of the faculty, the addresses were returned, sorted and recoded into the sixty-nine departmental categories which were included in the questionnaire. These recoded addresses, in most cases the name of a department, were merged with the respondent's data record and used as a supplement for the respondent's self-reported teaching department, especially useful for those who failed to answer the whole of the question on that matter. At the same time a master file was created for merging with the data files. These files contained: for the faculty only, the recoded departmental mailing address; for all respondents, indications of when the respondent returned his completed questionnaire, and a system for cross-referencing all the different serial numbers used for any respondent, thus allowing the study to accumulate information on non-respondents, and to eliminate duplicate responses.

Quality Control of Data

Quality control of the data from NCS took several forms. After the coding specifications were sent to NCS a sample of two hundred questionnaires for each of the faculty and graduate studies was coded by hand in Berkeley and a tape prepared to be checked against the machine coded tapes for the same questionnaire prepared by National Computer Systems. Several procedures were used to check the accuracy of the

machine coding: marginal distributions were compared, contingencies built into the coding were checked, and finally a column by column check was carried out. Dummy questionnaires were created to check coding possibilities not covered in the two hundred questionnaires. As a result of this, the proportion of errors in the final data tapes was very small. The same process was later used to check the quality of the undergraduate and researcher data.

Programs for contingency checking were developed for "cleaning" the data to insure that instructions were followed by respondents and to assure that the analysis would at all times examine only those respondents to whom a particular question was intended to apply.

Study of Respondent Bias

During this period an intensive study of faculty and graduate non-respondents was undertaken to learn who they were in order to be able to properly weight for any response bias. After approximately fifty percent of the sample had responded random samples of 2000 cases (both faculty and graduate) were selected for an intensive follow-up. Of these, approximately half had responded by the time the follow-up began. The remainder were first sent an additional questionnaire and then telephoned. The phoning operation had three major functions: First to identify respondents who were either no longer available or ineligible, and therefore not genuinely part of our survey; second, to encourage genuine respondents to return their completed questionnaires; and third, failing that, to elicit from them over the phone responses to seven questions which would give us valuable data which would allow us to characterize non-respondents for the subsequent weighting operation.

On the first call, telephone interviewers were instructed to encourage the respondent to complete and return the questionnaire. If the respondent agreed to do so, the interview was terminated. If the respondent indicated that he did not intend to complete the questionnaire he was asked a brief list of questions identical to items on the questionnaire. After a lapse of some weeks, those respondents who had not completed the questionnaire but who had indicated willingness to do so were called again. On the second call they were again encouraged to complete the questionnaire but were asked the brief list of questions whether or not they agreed to complete the questionnaire.

Of those selected for the graduate telephone sample, 1543 completed the graduate questionnaire, 173 others answered the brief list of questions, 151 could not be located. Of those selected for the faculty telephone sample, 1512 completed the questionnaire, 214 answered the brief list of questions, 87 could not be located and 59 were not followed-up because of a computer error. Over 85% of the people in both samples responded either to the full questionnaire or to the additional questions during the phone interview (See Non-Response Bias pp.49- 73).

Development of an Institutional File

An institutional file for all colleges and universities in the United States was created. It is based on information gathered from the American Council on Education, from the HEGIS tapes sent to us by the Office of Education, and from a variety of published sources not available on magnetic tape. This file is

used for general descriptive purposes and has been added to the data tapes for uses in data analysis. It was essential to the development of an accurate weighting scheme. A major part of the individual weight is a function of the institutional weight.

IV

The fourth major period of work, 3/1/70 to 1/1/71, was taken up in the development of weighting schemes for the faculty and graduate studies, analysis of response bias, creation of data samples and production of weighted and unweighted marginal tabulations.

Faculty and Graduate

Disproportionate sampling and the failure of some institutions to respond to the request for lists required that cooperating institutions be differentially weighted. As a first step in the computation of these weights, all institutions were assigned to their 1966 cells (on the basis of information supplied by ACE).¹⁰ Table 4 summarizes this procedure. It shows that all but 228 of the 2843 institutions listed by the U.S. Office of Education (data tape on Opening Fall Enrollment, 1968), (HEGIS II) would have been eligible for inclusion and could be located within the 1966 scheme based on institutional type and affluence or enrollment. The 228 ineligible institutions contain only slightly more than 2 percent of the faculty and less than 4 percent of the graduate students in American colleges and universities. The bulk of ineligible faculty and graduate students teach or are enrolled in 123 theological seminaries or in 31 independent graduate or professional schools.

Branch or satellite campuses of institutions included in the ACE sampling frame were assigned to the sampling cell occupied by the main campus. Although in some cases the branch campus lists were provided either directly or by the main campus, both faculty and graduate students at such branch campuses are in general underrepresented in the sample. Since we have no way of distinguishing between main and branch campus respondents, there is no way we can exclude them from the sample or adjust for their lesser likelihood of appearing in the sample by adjusting

¹⁰. For its own surveys, ACE no longer relies on its 1966 stratification scheme. For a summary and justification of the various stratification dimensions used by ACE over the course of its research program, see Alan E. Bayer et al., Users' Manual: ACE Higher Education Data Bank. Washington: American Council on Education, 1969.

Table 4 -A

30

Assignment of Institutions to 1966 ACE Cells
With Faculty Institutional Weights

ACE 1966 Cell		ENROLL- MENT	Universe		Sample		Faculty Weight
			# of Inst.	Faculty Number	# of Inst.	Faculty Number	
Public	1	Low	172	6108	6	390	15.66
2-Year	2	.	182	10621	7	447	23.76
Colleges	3	.	175	17567	7	593	29.62
	4	.	54	9068	5	645	14.06
	5	High	50	12352	5	1457	8.48
Private	6	Low	229	6824	10	353	19.33
2-Year	7	.	--	--	--	--	19.33
Colleges	8	.	36	2664	4	343	7.77
	9	High	--	--	--	--	7.77
AFFLUENCE							
	10	Unknown	-----				
	11	Low	15	6780	4	2691	2.52
	12	.	10	3715	5	2418	1.54
	13	.	47	18079	5	5815	3.11
Univer-	14	.	52	20306	12	9401	2.16
sities	15	.	18	13382	5	4362	3.07
	16	.	69	36638	13	19060	1.92
	17	.	32	22036	23	18512	1.19
	18	.	44	19177	8	8146	2.35
	19	High	76	67775	26	36316	1.87
	20	Unknown	-----				
	21	Low	449	37497	30	2818	13.31
	22	.	248	34436	20	3010	11.44
4-Year	23	.	250	34435	22	2241	15.37
Colleges	24	.	175	30891	26	4769	6.48
	25	.	84	11747	19	2091	5.62
	26	.	56	8753	25	3799	2.30
	27	.	29	5078	12	2401	2.11
	28	.	24	3369	9	1733	1.94
	29	High	39	6998	18	3160	2.21
Eligible Total			2615	446296 ⁺	326*	136971	[3.26]
No Under-	}	Ineligible Insti- tutions	8	918	0	--	--
graduates 30							
Seminaries 31			123	3137	0	--	--
Professional							
Schools 32			31	4965	0	--	--
Freshman							
Class 30							
Students 33			66	1302	0	--	--
TOTAL INELIGIBLE			228	10322	0	--	--
GRAND TOTAL			2843	456618	x	x	x

+97.74% of total.

*The number of institutions given here includes branch campuses counted as separate institutions by OE. This number includes the 303 institutions indicated in Table 1 plus the branch campus.

37

Table 4 -B

Assignment of Institutions to 1966 ACE Cells
With Graduate Student Institutional Weights

ACE 1966		ENROLL- MENT	Universe		Sample		Graduate Weight
Cell			# of Inst.	Graduate Numbers	# of Inst.	Graduate Numbers	
Public	1	Low	172				
2-Year	2	.	182				
Colleges	3	.	175				
	4	.	54				
	5	High	50				
Private	6	Low	229				
2-Year	7	.	--				
Colleges	8	.	36				
	9	High	--				
AFFLUENCE							
	10	Unknown	--				
	11	Low	15	27447	4	9403	2.92
	12	.	10	14468	5	12147	1.19
	13	.	47	43664	5	15202	2.87
Univer-	14	.	52	73872	11	23486	3.15
sities	15	.	18	42569	5	12320	3.46
	16	.	69	121747	13	60904	2.00
	17	.	32	71985	18	57486	1.25
	18	.	44	69290	7	31898	2.17
	19	High	76	187622	18	93878	2.00
	20	Unknown	--				
	21	Low	697	119903	18	6446	18.60
	22	.	--	--	--	--	18.60
4-Year	23	.	425	151499	17	12928	11.72
Colleges	24	.	--	--	--	--	11.72
	25	.	84	23235	6	2116	10.98
	26	.	56	20119	15	4932	4.08
	27	.	29	13240	7	8803	1.50
	28	.	24	8178	6	3794	2.16
	29	High	39	13853	10	6246	2.22
ELIGIBLE TOTAL			2615	1002691 ⁺⁺	165	361989	2.77/
No Under-							
graduates	30	Ineligible Insti- tutions	8	4432	0	--	--
Seminaries	31		123	17813	0	--	--
Professional	32		31	13257	0	--	--
Schools	32						
Freshman							
Class	30						
Students	33		66	2976	0	--	--
TOTAL INELIGIBLE			228	38478	0	--	--
GRAND TOTAL			2843	1041169	x	x	x

++96.30% of total

the magnitude of their weights. (The bias is not large. About 6 percent (61,000) of all graduate students are enrolled at such campuses. The names of 5,500 of these were on lists sent to the Carnegie Commission.)

Initial assignment of institutions to the 1966 ACE cells revealed that the "unknown" categories of affluence for both universities and colleges were greatly undersampled. Rather than assign very large weights to these undersampled institutions, we attempted to distribute them over the other sampling cells on the basis of affluence information not available to ACE in 1966. All universities were easily reassigned on the basis of current information. Although per-student expenditure information was still unavailable for many four-year colleges, those for whom such information had become available were generally poor. We therefore combined the "unknown" category with the lowest category of affluence in the case of faculty and with the two lowest four-year college affluence cells in the case of graduate students.¹¹

Finally, two faculty junior college cells and one graduate student four-year college cell were sufficiently undersampled that we considered it necessary for purposes of weighting to combine them with adjacent and much better sampled cells.

Once these operations were performed, we determined the total number of graduate students in each cell from enrollment information provided by the Office of Education¹²; faculty numbers were obtained from the

11. "Faculty" institutions are of course more numerous than "graduate student" institutions in the four-year college category. Undersampling problems were thus less serious for the faculty than for the graduate student sample.

12. Magnetic tapes provided by the Office of Education.

College Blue Book, World Almanac, and ACE's American Universities
and Colleges.¹³ Table 4 shows the number of faculty and graduate students in each cell in the universe of colleges and universities and in sample institutions. It also shows the base institutional weight by dividing the number in the universe by the number in the sample.

Once these institutional weights had been computed, we were in a position to check for possible bias in the sample. The first check was on institutional quality. The weights were first used to estimate the total number of faculty and graduate students in each of several quality strata. These estimates were then compared with the actual number derived from both published sources and data tapes provided by the Office of Education. The Office of Education projected that there were 841,622 graduate students registered in Master's, Doctoral, or First Professional Degree programs in 1968. The remaining graduate students are in non degree or special programs. The projected total includes only graduate students in eligible institutions and does not include students in autonomous graduate institutions such as theological seminaries, independent medical or law schools, or graduate institutions that have no undergraduates. The results for graduate students are shown in Table 5.

13. The College Blue Book, 1969/70 -- 13th Edition, New York: CCM Information Corporation, 1969. (This edition contains faculty figures for 1968-1969) World Almanac, 1969, Newspaper Enterprise Assoc., 1969.

American Universities and Colleges -- 10th Edition, Washington D.C. ACE, 1968.

Table 5

Actual Population of Graduate Students in Quality Strata and
Number of Graduate Students Estimated from 1966 ACE Cells

<u>Quality Ranking</u>	<u>Actual Population</u>	<u>Categories</u>	
		<u>Estimates from ACE Strata</u>	<u>%Estimate Over or Under Actual Population</u>
<u>Universities (Total)</u>	<u>652,664</u>	<u>652,663</u>	
High	172,330	226,983	(+) 31.7%
Medium	258,232	231,134	(-) 10.5%
Low	222,102	194,546	(-) 12.4%
<u>Colleges (Total)</u>	<u>350,027</u>	<u>350,027</u>	
High	60,791	78,190	(+) 28.6%
Medium	120,682	114,927	(-) 4.8%
Low	168,554	156,910	(-) 6.9%

Table 5 shows that high-quality institutions, both colleges and universities, were substantially overrepresented in the original ACE sample. Since, as noted in an earlier footnote, ACE departed from a strictly random procedure by including in the final sample 71 pilot study institutions (many of whom were initially selected by non-random means), and since this pilot study was known to overrepresent high-quality institutions, all pilot study institutions were eliminated from the sample and institutional weights recomputed for only those institutions selected according to a strictly random procedure. This approach did not improve the weights.

Elimination of pilot-study institutions reduced only slightly the overall bias toward high-quality institutions in the sample. Since the loss in sample breadth appeared to be greater than the gain in reduction of bias, we returned pilot study institutions and adjusted for bias within the limits provided by the sample. After the extent of bias

Table 6

Correction Factors for Quality and Control Bias in 1966 ACE
Sample -- Faculty and Graduate Students

<u>Quality</u> <u>Universities</u>	<u>Public Institutions</u>	
	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Graduate Students</u>
High	.987	.793
Medium	1.273	1.190
Low	1.180	1.094
<u>4-Year Colleges</u>		
High	.973	.708
Medium	1.001	2.078
Low	1.679	1.021
<u>Junior Colleges</u>	.990	--
<u>Quality</u> <u>Universities</u>	<u>Private Institutions</u>	
	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Graduate Students</u>
High	.695	.731
Medium	.781	.978
Low	1.129	1.222
<u>4-Year Colleges</u>		
High	.872	.951
Medium	.511	.500
Low	1.059	1.220
<u>Junior Colleges</u>	1.067	--

with respect to geographical location, size, and public or private control as well as quality had been determined, it was decided that it was both necessary and feasible to adjust the sample weights simultaneously for quality and type of control. These adjustments or correction factors for the various quality-control categories are shown in Table 6. (Correction factors are the ratios of the actual cell population to the cell population estimated from 1966 ACE strata (See Table 5. The ratio-adjustments were made within quality-control cells rather than original sampling cells. Although this facilitates the weighting procedure it introduces minor distortion). A correction factor of .500 indicates that the estimated number of faculty (or graduate students) in the cell is twice as large as the actual number of faculty and that responses of faculty in this cell will be reduced by one-half in estimating the distribution of responses in the population as a whole.

The weights and corrections to this point adjust the data for disproportionate sampling of institutions. The data must also be adjusted for three additional sources of variation: institutional non-response (the lists of faculty and graduate students sent to the Carnegie Commission were variably complete); sampling of individuals from the lists (in the case of faculty, a systematic sample of six-sevenths, secured by removing every seventh case from the list and retaining the remainder in the sample; in the case of graduate students, a systematic sample of one-sixth obtained by selecting every fourth case and subsequently removing every third case from those selected); and, finally, individual nonresponse. All of these variations are taken into account when we divide the total number of faculty or graduate students in an institution (according to published--i.e., independent information) by the number of faculty or graduate student respondents

in the institution. This procedure assumes that the lists provided by the institution are representative of all persons in the institution; it also assumes that respondents within an institution are representative of non-respondents within that institution.

Extreme graduate weights were reduced by combining low-response (or incomplete list) institutions with institutions similar with respect to quality, size, type of control, and geographical region. All in all, seven small institutions were combined with other institutions for this purpose.

The final weights used for the tabulations in this report are thus an attempt to take into account the sampling of institutions, bias with respect to quality and control, sampling of individuals, and two types of nonresponse. These weights range in magnitude from 1.34 to 103.09 for faculty and from 0.82 to 1314.94 for graduate students. The actual distribution of weights is shown in Table 7.

Of 51,682 questionnaires sent to graduate students enrolled in participating institutions, 32,963 or 64.0 percent were eventually returned in usable form.¹⁴ Of the 100,290 questionnaires sent to faculty, 60,028 or 59.8 percent were returned. While these return rates are excellent for a mail questionnaire, the problem of nonresponse bias remains.

14. An additional 650 (or 1.3 percent of the total) questionnaires were returned to the Commission. Of these 378 were determined to be undergraduates and thus ineligible for the survey. Ninety-three questionnaires were returned with the identification number defaced such that institutional affiliation could not be determined. The remaining usable questionnaires were duplicates of questionnaires already returned. One hundred and seventy graduate students returned blank questionnaires.

Table 7

Distribution of Final Weights Adjusted for Quality,
Control, and Nonresponse -- Faculty and Graduate Students

<u>Weight</u>	<u>Number of Institutions</u>	
	<u>Faculty</u>	<u>Graduate Students</u>
0.0-4.9*	111	3
5.0-9.9	52	3
10.0-14.9	25	22
15.0-19.9	22	20
20.0-24.9	26	15
25.0-29.9	15	11
30.0-34.9	19	9
35.0-39.9	10	11
40.0-49.9	11	3
50.0-99.9	11	27
100.0-199.9	1	16
200.0-299.9	-	4
300.0-399.9	-	3
400.0-499.9	-	-
500.0-999.9	-	4
1000.0-or greater**	-	4

TOTALS 303 155***

*Minimum weight, faculty = 1.34 ; graduate students = .82 .

**Maximum weight, faculty = 103.09 ; graduate students = 1314.94.

***Three four-year colleges (from which a total of eight graduate students were sampled) were eliminated at the last stage of weighting because of non-response.

Several methods for estimating the extent of such bias are possible. We chose to compare the obtained sample with a smaller sample intensively followed-up, and this process is described in the Non-response section on pp. 49-73.

Undergraduate

The undergraduate data posed several weighting problems which were not found in the other studies. The first was the problem of defining the universe we were weighting toward. In the undergraduate study, the weighted sample predicts the number of students who entered institutions of higher education during the Fall of years 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 with the following limitations:

1. All institutions included were accredited in 1966 and listed by U.S. Office of Education in their publication Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education. (Part A, Summary Data) Thus, newly founded or recently accredited institutions were likely to be excluded.
2. Those institutions which had an opening fall enrollment of less than 30 students in 1966 were eliminated.
3. The enrollment data were derived from tapes supplied by the Office of Education to the Carnegie Commission. Inconsistencies in institution I.D. numbers, differences between the tape content and published data, errors in reading tapes by the computer, and the omission of newly founded or accredited institutions led to small differences between our total enrollment figures and those published by the Office of Education. See Table 8.

Table 8
Entering Undergraduate Enrollment Data

	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Our Total	1,535,756	1,554,218	1,711,446	1,737,675
Office of Education				
Total	1,565,564	1,652,317	1,907,938	1,983,525

4. The Office of Education changed their definition of entering student during the four years for which we collected data. The figures given above are as follows:

- 1966 "First time students" both full-time and part-time.
- 1967 "First time Freshmen students" both full-time and part-time.
- 1968 "First time students working toward B.A. degree" and "First time students not working toward a B.A. degree" both part-time and full-time.
- 1969 "First time Freshmen students" both full-time and part-time.

It must be pointed out that the weights do not account for the total number of students currently in American higher education, but rather for the number of students who entered during one of the four years. Because this is true, separate weights had to be calculated for each cohort of entering students. The method of calculating the weights is as follows:

1. Since we sampled a quota of students from each institution, and institutions differed in their response rate, we first calculated an INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE WEIGHT which was the ratio of the number of students in the institution to the number who actually responded. This weight accounts for both different sampling rates and differential response rates.

$$\text{INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE} = \frac{\text{Total Entering Students}}{\text{Students Who Responded}}$$

2. Since the sample of institutions was drawn from the universe according to 29 sampling strata, we next calculated a STRATUM WEIGHT which represents the ratio of the number of students in institution included in the stratum to the number of students in sample institutions also in that stratum. Because private institutions were heavily oversampled and

public institutions were heavily undersampled we calculated strata weights separately for public and private institutions in each stratum (See Table 9).

Further, since all strata were not evenly represented by institutions, we found it necessary to combine several neighboring strata to achieve more stable weights. The strata combined were: Public = (1,2, and 3), (4 and 5), (11 and 12), (18 and 19), (20 and 21), (26, 27, 28, and 29). Private = (6,7,8 and 9), (15 and 16), (18 and 19), (20 and 21). In 1969 we also had to combine: Public = (14,15),(20,21,22). Private = (15, 16, 17).

$$\text{STRATUM WEIGHT} = \frac{\text{Total Students in all Institutions in Stratum}}{\text{Students in Sample Institutions in Stratum}}$$

3. An individual student's weight was the product of his institution's response weight and the appropriate stratum weight. However, we found that this weight, while it correctly predicted the distribution of students in the universe according to the sampling cells, failed to predict their distribution according to the quality of the institution. When we observed the distribution of students by the quality of their institution and compared this to the distribution of all the students who entered higher education, we found that there was need for an adjustment in the weight so that quality would be correctly predicted. The adjustments for quality (calculated separately for public and private institutions) are the ratio between the actual number of students in a quality cell and our estimate based on the previous weights. The adjustment factors are shown in Table 10.

$$\text{ADJUSTMENT FACTOR} = \frac{\text{Actual Students by Institutional Quality}}{\text{Estimated Students by Institutional Quality}}$$

Table 9

Strata Weights

ACE 1966 Cell	ENROLLMENT	1966		1967		1968		1969	
		Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private	Public	Private
Public	Low	110.56		106.79		126.71		160.59	
2-Year	.	110.56		106.79		126.71		160.59	
Colleges	.	110.56		106.79		126.71		160.59	
	.	13.45		15.95		18.17		22.66	
5	High	13.45		15.95		18.17		22.66	
Private	Low		17.92		17.87		19.17		28.15
2-Year	.		17.92		17.87		19.17		28.15
Colleges	.		17.92		17.87		19.17		28.15
9	High		17.92		17.87		19.17		28.15
AFFLUENCE									
10	Unknown	9.43	3.09	8.38	3.42	13.92	2.32	9.02	4.48
11	Low	9.43	1.23	8.38	1.15	13.92	1.15	9.02	1.18
12	.	7.55	1.61	8.85	1.67	10.52	1.74	9.26	2.07
13	.	4.51	3.08	5.17	2.85	5.35	1.12	6.29	12.72
14	.	3.01	6.41	3.42	6.58	3.72	6.97	6.29	6.90
15	.	3.58	6.41	3.32	6.58	4.44	6.97	3.52	6.90
16	.	3.61	4.21	3.55	3.42	3.10	3.74	3.14	6.90
17	.	15.90	3.67	12.54	3.83	17.68	3.48	16.94	4.46
18	.	15.90	3.67	12.54	3.83	17.68	3.48	16.94	4.46
19	High	80.60	16.57	87.67	15.61	86.27	15.20	133.59	16.31
20	Unknown	80.60	16.57	87.67	15.61	86.27	15.20	133.59	16.31
21	Low	53.00	9.94	44.66	9.74	37.79	10.33	133.59	11.52
22	.	31.50	14.15	35.22	13.48	35.33	13.50	32.46	16.44
23	.	8.79	6.41	7.94	6.14	8.25	6.35	7.15	6.26
24	.	9.97	5.41	10.40	5.40	10.95	5.04	10.90	5.12
25	.	3.58	4.99	3.37	4.55	3.04	4.06	5.24	4.71
26	.	3.58	4.07	3.37	4.42	3.04	4.37	5.24	4.71
27	.	3.58	2.44	3.37	2.72	3.04	2.48	5.24	3.19
28	.	3.58	2.14	3.37	2.02	3.04	2.03	5.24	2.47
29	High	2.58							

Table 10

Adjustment Factors

<u>Type and Quality</u>	1966		1967		1968		1969	
	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>	<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
University:								
High Quality	2.46	0.63	2.52	0.63	1.89	0.66	2.32	0.79
Med. Quality	0.74	1.00	0.75	1.07	0.77	1.07	0.76	0.75
Low Quality	1.17	1.34	1.15	1.33	1.33	1.30	1.15	1.39
4-Year College:								
High Quality	0.85	0.73	0.91	0.79	0.95	0.79	0.98	0.76
Med. Quality	0.58	0.77	0.59	0.78	0.58	0.75	0.32	0.69
Low Quality	1.36	1.24	1.36	1.22	1.41	1.25	5.84	1.36
Junior College:								
All Qualities	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

4. The product of the earlier student's weight and the appropriate adjustment factor produces the final weight used in this study. Table 11 shows the distribution of the weights by sampling strata and by institutional control, giving the highest and the lowest weight within each category of institutions.

$$\text{WEIGHT} = (\text{Institutional Response}) \times (\text{Stratum Weight}) \times (\text{Adjustment Factor})$$

5. In order to verify that the weights were computed correctly we checked to see that our estimates and the total sample were the same. Table 12 shows our estimate for the type of institutional control and Table 13 shows our estimate for the institutional quality. The small differences are due to rounding error. The use of the adjustment factor successfully corrected for institutional quality, but it changed the distribution by original sampling strata. The extent of the strata error is shown in Table 14. There is nothing we can do about this since we choose to sacrifice accuracy by strata to gain accuracy by quality which is much more important to our analysis.

Table 11

Range of Final Weights by Year

ACE 1966 Cell	ENROLLMENT	1966				1967				# of Inst.	
		Public		Private		Public		Private		Pub.	Priv.
		low	high	low	high	low	high	low	high		
1	Public	380	1095	--	--	380	1133	--	--	4	0
2	2-Year	1240	1240	--	--	806	806	--	--	1	0
3	Colleges	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0
4	.	310	447	--	--	455	471	--	--	2	0
5	High	2306	882	--	--	1503	1666	--	--	2	0
6	Low	--	--	39	107	--	--	41	112	0	5
7	.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0
8	.	--	--	169	241	--	--	152	224	0	3
9	High	--	--	--	--	--	--	123	123	0	1
AFFLUENCE											
10	Unknown	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0
11	Low	138	138	11	51	--	--	10	46	0	2
12	.	--	--	28	38	--	--	18	19	0	2
13	.	238	238	20	157	167	167	17	187	1	3
14	.	235	101	31	63	99	190	31	58	3	3
15	.	148	148	19	87	230	230	23	125	1	2
16	.	76	220	--	--	31	155	--	--	5	0
17	.	14	120	54	54	11	105	43	43	7	1
18	.	--	--	18	21	--	--	23	29	0	2
19	High	223	238	10	34	169	278	13	51	2	5
20	Unknown	--	--	58	85	--	--	34	88	0	5
21	Low	874	874	23	141	959	959	24	130	1	14
22	.	249	497	18	105	277	553	20	92	2	10
23	.	205	296	23	86	199	368	24	98	2	14
24	.	62	109	11	58	69	108	10	44	5	17
25	.	20	118	8	32	18	79	9	28	3	13
26	.	17	24	6	20	11	29	7	14	5	14
27	.	--	--	7	24	--	--	6	15	0	5
28	.	--	--	4	34	--	--	7	28	0	8
29	High	--	--	2	7	--	--	2	9	0	13

F

Table 11(cont'd.)

ACE 1966 Cell	ENROLLMENT	1968						1969						# of Inst.	
		Public			Private			Public			Private				
		low	high	low	high	low	high	low	high	low	high	low	high	Pub.	Priv.
Public	Low	439	1766	--	--	--	--	856	2129	--	--	--	--	3	0
2-Year	.	841	841	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0
Colleges	.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0
	.	395	1651	--	--	--	--	514	514	--	--	--	--	1	0
	High	1061	1855	--	--	--	--	2458	1763	--	--	--	--	2	0
	Low	--	--	40	68	--	--	--	--	58	128	--	--	0	5
Private	.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0
2-Year	.	--	--	179	300	--	--	--	--	229	239	--	--	0	2
Colleges	High	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0
AFFLUENCE															
	Unknown	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0
	Low	227	227	7	34	--	--	224	224	778	778	--	--	1	1
	.	--	--	16	21	--	--	--	--	15	35	--	--	0	2
	.	240	240	22	239	--	--	323	323	31	391	--	--	1	2
Univer-	.	265	135	36	87	--	--	186	322	104	104	--	--	3	1
sities	.	151	151	36	186	--	--	--	--	136	34	--	--	0	2
	.	70	287	--	--	--	--	66	314	--	--	--	--	5	0
	.	14	135	60	60	--	--	19	155	--	--	--	--	6	0
	.	--	--	23	31	--	--	2893	2893	--	--	--	--	1	0
	High	310	311	18	46	--	--	269	269	28	150	--	--	1	5
	Unknown	--	--	37	68	--	--	--	--	23	134	--	--	0	4
	Low	1306	1306	21	145	--	--	--	--	27	124	--	--	0	13
	.	377	596	24	83	--	--	635	635	18	153	--	--	1	9
4-Year	.	182	423	19	93	--	--	233	612	23	106	--	--	2	13
Colleges	.	77	123	11	86	--	--	70	920	11	54	--	--	5	17
	.	23	94	9	23	--	--	12	49	9	21	--	--	3	13
	.	14	43	4	19	--	--	11	93	5	35	--	--	3	13
	.	--	--	7	14	--	--	--	--	7	15	--	--	0	4
	.	--	--	5	27	--	--	--	--	7	46	--	--	0	7
	High	--	--	3	12	--	--	--	--	3	14	--	--	0	12

Table 12

Verification of Weights by Control

	1966		1967	
	<u>Estimated</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Estimated</u>	<u>Actual</u>
PUBLIC	1,104,607	1,104,611	1,134,608	1,134,612
PRIVATE	431,137	431,145	419,602	419,606
	1968		1969	
	<u>Estimated</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Estimated</u>	<u>Actual</u>
PUBLIC	1,281,144	1,281,148	1,298,762	1,298,905
PRIVATE	430,293	430,298	438,905	438,910

Table 13

Verification of Weights by Type and Quality

	1966		1967		1968		1969	
	<u>Estimated</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Estimated</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Estimated</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Estimated</u>	<u>Actual</u>
UNIVERSITY:								
Hi Qual	61,051	61,051	62,154	62,154	63,839	63,839	66,137	66,137
Med Qual	149,104	149,104	141,191	141,191	145,626	145,626	160,875	160,875
Low Qual	197,645	197,645	182,544	182,544	208,815	208,815	215,964	215,964
4 YEAR COLLEGES:								
Hi Qual	47,265	47,265	50,065	50,065	54,031	54,031	54,632	54,632
Med Qual	149,027	149,027	153,919	153,919	163,285	163,285	171,295	171,295
Low Qual	393,420	393,424	379,220	379,219	394,808	394,809	407,140	407,142
JUNIOR COLLEGES:								
All Qual	538,240	538,240	585,124	585,126	681,039	681,041	661,630	661,630

47

Table 14(cont'd.)

ACE 1966 Cell	ENROLL- MENT	Public 1968		Private 1968		Public 1969		Private 1969	
		Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual	Estimated	Actual
Pub.	1 Low	313,096	313,096			337,239	337,239		
2 Yr.	2 .								
Coll.	3 .								
	4 .	301,434	301,434			264,094	264,094		
	5 High								
Priv.	6 Low			66,511	66,511			60,297	60,297
2 Yr.	7 .								
Coll.	8 .								
	9 High								
AFFLUENCE									
	10 Unknown	20,639	26,801	4,857	4,379	17,447	22,823	9,261	6,653
	11 Low			3,617	2,777			3,839	2,758
	12 .	32,112	28,330	26,561	22,193	32,021	27,825	31,514	22,690
	13 .	48,290	42,603	18,099	15,641	58,874	51,160	11,596	15,545
	14 .	14,480	12,775	15,081	16,564			14,972	19,725
	15 .	89,244	75,512			103,110	91,036		
	16 .	49,241	47,607	4,536	3,482	55,627	51,915		
	17 .	68,253	88,632	23,267	31,062	72,407	94,724	32,307	36,239
	18 .								
	19 High								
	20 Unknown	120,116	85,407	72,047	59,311	66,461	206,260	73,097	56,367
	21 Low								
	22 .	98,279	113,104	46,630	46,145			45,294	45,839
	23 .	43,429	59,888	60,123	60,705	72,040	60,046	62,788	63,031
	24 .	57,089	58,108	34,456	36,417	180,997	62,724	35,736	37,422
	25 .	10,750	11,203	17,722	21,343	28,426	11,484	18,154	22,892
	26 .	14,698	16,648	16,996	21,000	9,842	17,433	18,740	29,211
	27 .			3,830	4,320			3,616	4,468
	28 .			8,452	9,039			10,050	10,819
	29 High			7,511	9,409			7,646	10,004
TOTAL		1,281,146	1,281,148	430,296	430,298	1,298,762	1,298,765	438,409	438,410
				100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

There is considerable variation in the size of the weights from a low of about 2 to a high around 2,000. While this much variation is technically satisfactory, care must be taken in analysis so that misleading results are not obtained from the analysis of a few students with very high weights. It should be noted that the weights do not totally eliminate the bias introduced by non-random institutional selection on the non-response bias. (A discussion of undergraduate non-response bias appears on pp.).

Nonresponse Bias

A random sample of graduate students and faculty was drawn for intensive follow-up. Two thousand faculty members and 2,037 graduate students were selected from the original samples. At the time the samples were drawn, over 50% of these special samples had returned the appropriate questionnaire. Approximately 1,000 graduate students and 800 faculty members were thus left to follow-up. The intention was to compare these special samples, both with a high rate of response, with the respective full samples to determine the extent of the bias, if any, that results from response rates of 64% for the graduate students and 60% for the faculty. Six items were chosen for the follow-up sample, items thought to represent possible bias.¹⁵ These will be examined in some detail below.

Faculty

Of those drawn in the special faculty sample, 1512 respondents completed the faculty questionnaire, 214 answered the brief list of questions asked in the telephone interview providing information comparable to that

15. The six items asked in the telephone interview were: Rank, Kind of appointment (tenure), Highest degree, Date of birth, Research or Teaching as primary interest and Political identification.

on the questionnaire, 128 faculty members refused to answer any questions; 87 could not be located; 59 individuals were not contacted because of assurances that the questionnaire had been returned, although in fact they were not.

We have, then, a response rate in this special sample of 76% to the whole questionnaire and of 86% to the six items asked both in the questionnaire and in the telephone interview. This is a conservative estimate of response rate in this special sample, since it is likely that at least some of the 87 who could not be located had in fact left academic life, and were therefore no longer part of the population which we were sampling.

By comparing the 2,000 sample, the sample which best represents the population, with the total sample we can discover the differences, if any, between a sample with a return rate of 60% and a sample with a return rate of 86%. In the following discussion we will, for the most part, be comparing distributions of characteristics in a sample of the "achieved" sample with distributions in the special or "criterion" sample of 2,000.¹⁶ Several weighted distributions on the entire "achieved" sample are presented below for comparison with a sample of the achieved sample and the criterion sample. Because of the expense of using the entire "achieved" sample most of the distributions are presented for a random sample of 8,500 drawn from the total sample of 60,000.

The most complete respondent information is available for sex and

16. The "criterion" sample includes 1197 people who responded before the phone survey, 542 who responded after being phoned and 214 who answered only the telephone interview. The "telephone" sample includes only the latter two categories, i.e., only the respondents in the nonrespondent sample. Except where otherwise indicated, tables are presented with the not answered category excluded.

quality of institution. For both variables we have information from independent sources. As we can see in Table 15A, the criterion sample does not differ on sex from the achieved sample; Table 15B indicates that while medium quality universities are very slightly overrepresented and faculty in junior colleges slightly underrepresented the achieved sample is remarkably close to the criterion sample.

Table 15A

Distribution of Sex in the Achieved and
Criterion Samples (Faculty) 17a

<u>SEX</u>	<u>Total Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>
Male	80.0	80.0	79.9
Female	<u>20.0</u>	<u>20.0</u>	<u>20.1</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Unweighted N	58884	8500	1901
All Other	<u>1183</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>99</u>
Unweighted Total	60,028	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(446,203)	(61,117) 17b	*

17a. All tables are presented in weighted form; for an explanation of the weighting scheme used, refer to page 29. The weights for the criterion samples are constructed from the institutional base weight excluding institutional non-response and correcting for quality and type of control.

17b. The weighted total presented here is approximately a seventh of the projected population total of 466,203. This is a function of using a sample that is approximately a seventh of the obtained N of 60,028 for the faculty.

Table 15B

Distribution of Quality in the Achieved and
Criterion Samples (Faculty)

<u>QUALITY</u>	<u>Total Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>
Universities			
High Quality	12.6	12.5	11.4
Medium Quality	18.1	18.1	15.6
Low Quality	15.8	15.7	15.5
Colleges			
High Quality	5.7	5.6	6.0
Medium Quality	10.9	10.9	11.7
Low Quality	22.4	22.3	23.6
Junior Colleges	<u>14.6</u>	<u>14.6</u>	<u>16.2</u>
	100.1	99.7	100.0
Unweighted N	60,028	8500	2000
All Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Unweighted Total	60,028	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(446,203)	(61,117)	*

Table 16

Distributions of Selected Characteristics in the
Achieved Sample and the Criterion Sample (Faculty)

<u>RANK</u>	<u>Total Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>
Professor	22.8	23.5	22.0
Associate Professor	21.0	20.7	18.6
Assistant Professor	27.6	27.8	27.3
Instructor	19.2	18.3	19.7
Lecturer	2.9	2.8	3.2
No rank designated	3.9	4.3	5.9
Other	<u>2.5</u>	<u>2.5</u>	<u>3.3</u>
	99.9	99.9	100.0
Unweighted N	59836	8478	1718
All Other	<u>192</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>282</u>
Unweighted Total	60,028	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(446,203)	(61,177)	*

Table 16 (cont'd)

<u>KIND OF APPOINTMENT</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>
Regular with tenure	50.7	48.7
Regular without tenure	44.8	45.2
Acting	2.0	2.0
Visiting	<u>2.6</u>	<u>4.5</u>
	100.1	100.4
Unweighted N	8429	1694
All Other	<u>71</u>	<u>306</u>
Unweighted Total	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(61,177)	*

FIELD OF HIGHEST
DEGREE

Business, Commerce and Management	4.0	5.6
Biological Sciences	7.3	6.7
Education	15.0	14.2
Engineering	5.8	5.4
Fine Arts	8.3	8.9
Old Professions--Medicine and Law	4.3	4.7
Humanities	21.7	20.7
Phys. Sci.--Math and Statistics	13.4	12.5
Psychology and Social Sci.	12.5	12.2
New and Semi-Professions	<u>7.7</u>	<u>8.9</u>
	100.0	99.8
Unweighted N	7418	1462
All Other	<u>1082</u>	<u>538</u>
Unweighted Total	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(61,177)	*

Table 16 (cont'd)

<u>HIGHEST DEGREE</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>
Ph.D.	41.5	37.2
First Professional--Medical Degree (eg., M.D., D.D.S.)	4.1	4.5
First Professional--Law Degree	1.2	1.3
Ed.D.	4.5	3.0
Other Doctorate	1.4	1.5
Doctorate of Arts or Equiv.	1.9	2.3
Other First Professional-- Beyond Undergrad Bachelors	7.7	6.6
Master's	32.1	35.6
Undergraduate Bachelor's	4.8	6.0
Less than Bachelor's	.6	.8
None	.2	.7
	100.0	100.0
Unweighted N	8106	1656
All Other	394	344
Unweighted Total	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(61,177)	*

DATE OF BIRTH

1903 or before	7.1	8.1
1909-1913	6.4	7.2
1914-1918	9.0	9.8
1919-1923	13.0	12.8
1924-1928	14.9	16.3
1929-1933	16.9	15.0
1934-1938	17.3	16.1
1939-1943	12.6	13.3
1944 or later	2.7	1.4
	99.9	100.0
Unweighted N	8353	1692
All Other	147	308
Unweighted Total	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(61,177)	*

Table 17

Faculty--Interests Primarily in Research or Teaching

	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>
Very Heavily in Research	4.1	3.6
In both--but Leaning Toward Research	20.4	19.6
In both--but Leaning Toward Teaching	33.7	30.5
Very Heavily in Teaching	<u>41.4</u>	<u>46.2</u>
	99.6	99.9
Unweighted N	8231	1621
All Other	<u>269</u>	<u>379</u>
Unweighted Total	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(61,117)	*

Table 18

Faculty--% with Interests Heavily in Teaching by
Quality of Institution

	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>
<u>Universities</u>		
High Quality	15.5	22.6
Medium Quality	22.2	23.8
Low Quality	31.7	38.2
<u>Colleges</u>		
High Quality	32.5	36.9
Medium Quality	45.4	55.8
Low Quality	53.5	54.3
<u>Junior Colleges</u>	<u>73.9</u>	<u>75.1</u>
Unweighted N	(2517)	(554)

Table 19

Political Self-Identification (Faculty)

	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>
Left	4.8	5.2
Liberal	39.0	39.5
Middle-of-the-Road	26.3	25.7
Moderately Conservative	24.4	20.8
Strongly Conservative	2.5	2.6
Refused (Telephone Questionnaire Only) Not Answered	<u>3.1</u>	<u>5.6</u>
	100.1	99.4
Unweighted N	8299	1704
All Other	<u>201</u>	<u>296</u>
Unweighted Total	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(61,177)	*

Distributions in Table 16 indicate that there are no major differences between the achieved sample and the criterion sample on rank, appointment and field of highest degree. The only real difference appears in the distribution of advanced degrees. The achieved sample slightly overrepresents faculty members with Ph.D.'s and underrepresents faculty members with Master's and Doctor of Arts degrees. It does not appear, however, that the criterion sample includes more younger men working toward advanced degrees. It is more likely that this is a function of the slight underrepresentation of Junior College faculty in the achieved sample.

One further difference emerges in the item on research and teaching interests. Table 17 indicates a 5% difference between the achieved and criterion sample in the number of respondents whose primary interest is "very heavily in teaching." It appears that the achieved

sample somewhat overrepresents individuals interested in research or research and teaching. Interestingly this difference appears also in universities and is not a function only of the lack of a research choice in colleges and junior colleges (Table 18).

There are reasons to expect the nonresponse rate among the left to be somewhat high. Research focused specifically on activists on the left is frequently condemned in radical literature; research itself is often the target for much debate and sometimes demonstration. Table 19 indicates that there is little difference between the achieved sample and the criterion sample. The "not answered" category for both samples is slightly larger than in many attitudinal questions in the achieved sample. The number is too small to analyze in detail but some preliminary tables indicate that respondents who refused to answer or who did not answer do not cluster in any particular age, department, or rank categories.

The similarity of the two samples holds up equally well if we turn from marginal to bi-variate tabulations. Although there are some differences in particular cells the distributions are quite similar. Table 20A and 20B compare rank within categories of quality for the achieved and the criterion sample. Tables 21A and 21B compare age for both samples. The minor discrepancies in the joint distributions may be real deviations (e.g., the differences between the proportion holding the rank of professor in the achieved (34%) and the criterion (30%)) or they may be a function of the small N's in the criterion sample. The fit is close enough in both distributions to give us the same picture.

There is no apparent difference between the two samples, indicating that the respondents to the faculty survey are not significantly different.

from the non-respondents and that the 60% (achieved) sample adequately represents the total population.

TABLE 20A

Rank by Quality of Institution
Faculty-Achieved Sample

	Quality							Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Professor	33.9	30.0	24.5	28.0	20.8	23.2	6.5	23.5
Assoc. Prof.	19.7	24.7	25.4	23.9	22.3	20.6	8.3	20.7
Asst. Prof.	25.3	31.0	30.0	32.0	31.8	27.6	18.8	27.8
Instructor	8.7	9.0	16.4	10.4	19.8	24.5	33.2	18.3
Lecturer	6.6	3.5	1.7	2.4	2.4	1.8	1.9	2.8
No Rank	.5	.3	.2	.3	1.1	.9	26.9	4.3
Other	5.3	1.5	1.8	2.9	1.8	1.5	4.4	2.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	100.1	100.0	
Unweighted N	1901	2175	2109	646	724	630	293	8478
Unweighted All Other	4	6	5	1	4	2	0	22
Total	1905	2181	2114	647	728	632	293	8500
Weighted N	7614	11379	10492	3590	7536	13444	9031	63087

TABLE 20B

Rank by Quality of Institution
Faculty-Criterion Sample

	Quality							Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Professor	29.7	33.4	25.1	24.4	16.7	20.3	4.8	26.6
Assoc. Prof.	21.0	22.9	20.7	18.9	21.4	20.3	11.3	20.9
Asst. Prof.	26.3	25.6	33.7	29.9	37.3	32.8	4.8	28.7
Instructor	10.1	12.6	16.9	15.0	19.8	16.4	41.9	15.1
Lecturer	7.2	2.7	1.4	6.3	1.6	5.5	0.0	3.8
No Rank	1.0	.4	.2	1.6	1.6	1.6	29.0	1.8
Other	4.6	2.5	1.9	3.9	1.6	3.1	8.1	3.1
	99.9	100.1	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0
Unweighted N	414	446	415	127	126	128	62	1718
Unweighted All Other	99	74	51	18	16	14	10	282
Total	<u>513</u>	<u>520</u>	<u>466</u>	<u>145</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>72</u>	<u>2000</u>

TABLE 21A

Date of Birth by Quality of Institution
Faculty-Achieved Sample

	Quality							Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
-1908	7.1	7.7	7.4	6.1	5.6	9.0	4.8	7.1
1909-13	7.7	5.8	6.2	6.0	7.6	6.8	5.2	6.4
1914-18	8.9	9.3	8.0	10.8	7.6	10.4	8.5	9.0
1919-23	11.2	13.1	12.2	10.0	11.2	14.2	16.2	13.0
1924-28	15.2	16.1	15.9	15.2	13.0	13.3	15.6	14.9
1929-33	17.9	16.6	18.3	19.6	18.0	16.0	14.5	16.9
1934-38	19.3	18.1	16.1	16.9	18.8	15.8	17.3	17.3
1939-43	10.1	12.6	13.7	14.3	15.0	10.2	14.3	12.6
1944-	2.6	.8	2.1	1.0	3.1	4.5	3.6	2.7
	100.0	100.1	99.9	99.9	100.0	100.2	100.0	99.9
Unweighted N	1876	2142	2076	632	719	622	286	8353
Unweighted All Other	29	39	38	15	9	10	7	147
Total	<u>1905</u>	<u>2181</u>	<u>2114</u>	<u>647</u>	<u>728</u>	<u>632</u>	<u>293</u>	<u>8500</u>
Weighted N	7614	11379	10492	3590	7536	13444	9031	63087

TABLE 21B

Date of Birth by Quality of Institution
Faculty-Criterion Sample

	Quality							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
-1908	7.6	8.3	6.7	6.3	7.1	8.2	10.0	7.6
1909-13	5.6	9.0	7.2	4.8	6.3	13.1	13.3	8.5
1914-18	8.1	8.8	6.4	9.5	7.9	13.1	13.3	8.5
1919-23	12.7	12.8	14.6	11.1	13.4	9.0	18.3	13.1
1924-28	14.2	15.8	14.6	19.0	18.9	13.9	20.0	15.6
1929-33	18.9	15.3	16.0	7.9	13.4	14.8	11.7	15.5
1934-38	17.9	17.6	18.5	19.0	18.9	10.7	11.7	17.4
1939-43	11.8	11.7	14.6	20.6	14.2	16.4	10.0	13.5
1944-	3.2	.7	1.5	1.6	0.0	.8	1.7	1.5
	100.0	100.0	100.1	99.8	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0
Unweighted N	408	444	405	126	127	122	60	1692
Unweighted All								
Other	105	76	61	19	15	20	12	308
Total	513	520	466	145	142	142	72	2000
Weighted N	808	1111	1099	426	834	1676	1152	7108

Graduates

Of the 2037 graduate students drawn in the special sample, 1580 respondents completed the questionnaire, 190 answered the brief list of questions asked in the telephone interview, 128 graduate students refused to answer any questions and 139 were unlocatable.

For the graduate special or criterion sample we have a response rate of 78% to the whole questionnaire and of 87% to the six items¹⁸ asked both in the questionnaire and the telephone interview. This is,

18. The six items asked in the telephone interview were: year entered graduate school, highest degree working for, department, when degree expected, political identification and employment. Information was obtained on institutional quality and the respondent's sex from independent sources.

again, a conservative estimate since some of the 139 students who could not be located had undoubtedly left academic life.

By comparing the distributions of characteristics of the achieved and criterion¹⁹ samples we can determine whether the achieved sample, with a response rate of 64%, is in fact representative of the population from which it is drawn.

The most complete respondent information is available for quality of the respondent's institution and sex. Tables 22A and 22B give the distributions for both samples. The distributions for both variables in the two samples are quite close. Table 22A indicates that the achieved graduate sample somewhat underrepresents medium quality universities and overrepresents low quality colleges. Few graduate students are located in low quality colleges. The largest number of graduate students are located in medium quality universities, thus there is no serious bias in underrepresenting this category given, as we shall see below, that the criterion and the achieved samples appear quite similar on all other variables.

19. Several weighted distributions on the entire "achieved" sample are presented below. Because of the cost involved in using full samples the remaining distributions are presented for a sample of 8500 of the achieved sample. These are compared with the criterion sample. The criterion sample includes all 2,037 of the graduate students chosen for the special sample.

Table 22A

Distribution of Quality in the Achieved and
Criterion Samples (Graduate)^{20a}

<u>QUALITY OF INSTITUTION</u>	<u>Total Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>
Universities			
High Quality	17.1	16.6	16.9
Medium Quality	25.7	24.8	29.6
Low Quality	22.1	22.2	23.5
Colleges			
High Quality	6.0	6.0	5.3
Medium Quality	12.0	11.7	10.7
Low Quality	<u>17.1</u>	<u>18.6</u>	<u>13.9</u>
	100.0	99.9	99.9
Unweighted N	32,964	8500	2000
All Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Unweighted Total	32,964	8500	2000
Weighted Total	(1,005,834)	(264,017) ^{20b}	*

Table 22B

Distribution of Sex in the Achieved
and Criterion Samples (Graduate)

<u>SEX</u>			
Male	68.8	71.2	69.3
Female	<u>31.2</u>	<u>28.8</u>	<u>30.5</u>
	100.0	100.0	100.0
Unweighted N	32818	8462	2030
All Other	<u>145</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>7</u>
Unweighted Total	32,964	8500	2037
Weighted Total	(1,005,834)	(264,017)	*

20a. All tables are presented in weighted form; for an explanation of the weighting scheme used, refer to page 29. The weights for the criterion sample are constructed from the institutional base weight excluding institutional non-response and correcting for quality and control.

20b. The weighted total presented here is approximately a quarter of the projected population total of 1,005,834.

The distributions of "year entered graduate school," "highest degree working for," "when degree expected" and "department" are given in Table 23A-D. There appear to be some minor differences between the two samples. Fifty-one percent of the achieved sample entered graduate school between 1967 and 1969; 48% of the criterion sample entered in these years. Fifty-five percent of the achieved sample are working for Master's degrees as opposed to 51% in the criterion sample. Thirty-nine percent of the graduate students in the achieved sample expect their degree "this" (1969) year; 34% of those in the criterion sample expect their degree "this" year. The achieved sample, then, slightly undersamples long-term Ph.D. students. There do not appear to be any differences by field (Table 23D).

Graduate students were also asked about their employment status. Table 24 indicates that there are only minor differences between the two samples on this variable. As with the faculty samples we anticipated the possibility of bias on political characterization. Again, the two distributions are virtually identical (Table 25). The distributions are also quite similar when quality is introduced (Table 26). There are minor differences in particular cells but the relationship in both samples is the same. For both the criterion and the achieved samples the proportion of left and liberal graduate students decreases as the quality of the institution decreases. The one significant difference appears in the number of left graduate students in high quality colleges. The discrepancy between the two samples is, no doubt, a function of the small N in the criterion sample. (The unweighted N for this cell is 6.)

Table 23A

Distributions of Selected Characteristics in the
Achieved Sample and the Criterion Sample (Graduate)

In what year did you first enter graduate school?

	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>
1955 or before	3.4	5.2
1956-7	1.7	2.6
1958-9	2.3	2.6
1960-1	3.7	4.8
1962-3	7.9	7.7
1964	7.6	6.0
1965	9.4	9.8
1966	13.1	13.4
1967	22.4	17.5
1968-9	<u>28.5</u>	<u>30.0</u>
	100.0	99.6
Unweighted N	8188	1692
All Other	<u>312</u>	<u>345</u>
Unweighted Total	8500	2037
Weighted Total	(264,017)	

Table 23B

Highest degree working for

	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>
Ph.D.	22.6	24.7
First Professional Medical	4.7	5.0
First Professional Law	5.3	5.0
Ed.D.	2.2	2.0
Other Doctorate	.5	.3
Doctorate of Arts	.9	1.1
Other First Professional	6.1	5.8
M.A.T.	3.8	1.8
M.A.	50.9	48.8
B.A.	--	.7
Less than B.A.	--	--
None	<u>3.1</u>	<u>4.7</u>
	100.1	99.9
Unweighted N	7785	1609
All Other	<u>715</u>	<u>428</u>
Unweighted Total	8500	2037
Weighted Total	(264,017)	

54.7

50.6

Table 23C

When do you expect to get the degree you are now working for?

	<u>Achieved Sample</u>		<u>Criterion Sample</u>	
This year	39.1	74.5	33.6	68.2
Within 2 years	35.4		34.6	
Within 3 years	12.5		13.6	
Within 4 years	5.2		5.5	
Within 5 years	3.5		4.3	
6 or more years	1.7		2.9	
Don't expect to get	<u>2.6</u>		<u>5.4</u>	
	100.0		99.9	
Unweighted N	8136		1676	
All Other	<u>364</u>		<u>361</u>	
Unweighted Total	8500		2037	
Weighted Total	(264,017)			

Table 23D

Department in which you are studying

	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>
Business, Commerce, . . . Management	8.8	8.5
Biological Sciences	4.9	4.5
Education	22.3	22.7
Engineering	9.8	9.5
Fine Arts	3.6	3.2
Medicine and Law	8.2	8.4
Humanities	12.5	12.4
Physical Sciences, Math, Statistics	11.1	9.6
Social Sciences, Psychology	9.0	9.6
New and Semi-Professions	<u>10.0</u>	<u>12.0</u>
	100.2	100.4
Unweighted N	7965	1642
All Other	<u>535</u>	<u>385</u>
Unweighted Total	8500	2037
Weighted Total	(264,017)	

Table 24

Employment Status in the Achieved and
Criterion Samples (Graduate)

Are you now employed for a term or more while a graduate student as:

	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>
Part-time R.A.	8.3	11.6
Full-time research	3.3	
Part-time T.A.	11.3	15.4
Full-time teaching	4.1	
Faculty position	4.9	5.2
Other academic	8.4	7.2
None of these	<u>59.8</u>	<u>62.9</u>
	100.1	99.9
Unweighted N	6977	1451
All Other	<u>1523</u>	<u>586</u>
Unweighted Total	8500	2037
Weighted Total	(264,017)	

*The telephone respondents were not asked whether the position held was part- or full-time.

Table 25

Political Self-Identification (Graduate)

Left	5.8	5.8
Liberal	37.2	37.7
Middle-of-the-Road	27.7	27.1
Moderately Conservative	25.5	25.8
Strongly Conservative	<u>3.9</u>	<u>3.7</u>
	100.1	100.1
Unweighted N	8350	1707
All Other	<u>150</u>	<u>330</u>
Unweighted Total	8500	2037
Weighted Total	(264,017)	

Table 26A

Political Identification by Quality of Institution
(Achieved Sample)

POLITICS	QUALITY						
	Universities			Colleges			Total
	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	
Left	12.1	6.1	4.1	7.5	1.1	4.3	5.8
Liberal	48.4	40.7	35.3	35.0	33.1	28.1	37.2
Middle-of-the-Road	21.7	27.0	27.9	28.2	32.3	30.6	27.7
Moderately Conservative	16.4	23.3	28.6	28.5	27.8	30.3	25.5
Strongly Conservative	1.5	2.9	4.2	.8	5.7	6.7	3.9
Unweighted N	100.1	100.0	100.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1
All Other	2529	2786	2162	412	282	178	8349
	42	46	42	11	7	3	151
Unweighted Total	2571	2832	2204	423	289	181	8500
Weighted Total	43,944	65,522	58,712	15,972	30,774	49,064	264,017

Table 26B
Political Identification by Quality of Institution
 (Criterion Sample)

<u>POLITICS</u>	<u>QUALITY</u>						
	<u>Universities</u>			<u>Colleges</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>High</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Medium</u>	<u>Low</u>	
Left	15.1	6.3	5.0	2.3	1.0	0.0	8.2
Liberal	45.7	41.3	34.6	39.7	37.7	24.4	39.5
Middle-of-the-Road	22.3	25.8	27.4	35.1	31.3	28.6	25.8
Moderately Conservative	15.4	23.6	29.1	20.6	23.5	42.1	23.4
Strongly Conservative	1.7	3.2	3.9	2.3	6.4	4.9	3.0
	100.2	100.2	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0	99.9
Unweighted N	510	593	441	91	54	42	1731
All Other	91	100	78	14	11	12	306
Unweighted Total	601	693	519	105	65	54	2037

Table 27A

Age by Quality of Institution
(Achieved Sample)

AGE	<u>Universities</u>			<u>Colleges</u>			Total
	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	
21 or younger	2.4	1.3	.6	2.8	.2	0.0	1.0
22	11.7	8.7	7.4	9.0	5.6	1.6	7.3
23	13.1	11.1	9.8	12.3	10.8	5.2	10.1
24	12.7	11.1	9.6	9.4	11.3	5.4	9.9
25	12.2	11.1	8.9	8.7	6.7	8.0	9.5
26-27	16.1	17.0	15.7	15.7	14.3	10.2	14.9
28-29	10.0	9.7	11.4	6.5	9.6	9.9	10.0
30-34	10.0	13.4	17.0	20.3	13.8	26.1	16.5
35-39	5.7	7.6	8.0	5.6	9.3	9.5	7.8
40 or older	6.2	9.0	11.8	9.7	18.4	24.1	13.1
	100.1	100.0	100.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1
Unweighted N	2554	2806	2184	418	286	181	8429
All Other	17	26	20	5	3	0	71
Unweighted Total	2571	2836	2204	423	289	181	8500
Weighted Total	43,944	65,552	58,712	15,972	30,774	49,064	264,017

Table 27B

Age by Quality of Institution
(Criterion Sample)

AGE	<u>QUALITY</u>						
	<u>Universities</u>			<u>Colleges</u>			
	High	Medium	Low	High	Medium	Low	Total
21 or younger	1.9	1.1	.4	.8	1.2	0.0	.9
22	10.4	8.0	7.1	7.2	19.4	6.0	9.1
23	13.1	11.3	8.3	7.5	4.2	2.0	8.7
24	12.2	11.2	10.2	18.9	6.2	1.3	9.8
25	10.3	11.8	9.5	7.2	9.5	8.3	10.0
26-27	17.6	15.8	16.6	11.3	5.0	7.6	13.8
28-29	9.1	10.7	12.3	13.2	9.5	12.6	11.1
30-34	13.4	12.8	15.6	7.2	12.3	19.2	13.8
35-39	6.7	7.3	7.7	10.6	8.5	13.1	8.6
40 or older	5.3	10.0	12.4	16.2	24.2	29.6	14.2
	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.1	100.0	100.2	100.0
Unweighted N	516	598	445	91	57	40	1747
All Other	85	95	74	14	3	14	290
Unweighted Total	601	693	519	105	65	54	2037

The joint distributions of age and quality of institution are given in Table 27. There are, again, minor differences, due probably to the small N in the criterion sample. Overall, the distributions tell the same story. In general, we see that the age distributions are quite similar regardless of quality but that older students are slightly more likely to be found in lower quality colleges.

For graduate students as well as faculty we are confident that, with the minor exceptions indicated, the achieved samples represent the population from which they are drawn. We can also say that the non-respondents are not different from the respondents in ways significant to cause any substantial differences between the criterion and achieved samples.

Undergraduates

A total of 70,694 questionnaires were returned in usable form out of 171,520 mailed on December 20, 1969. This represents a response rate of 41.2%. The only addresses available were parents' addresses which, in many instances, were out of date. Parents were depended on to forward questionnaires to students who were not home for the Christmas break. No attempts were made to follow-up non-respondents.

A random sample of 10% of the entire sample of undergraduates to whom questionnaires were mailed was drawn for the non-response analysis. Our purpose, here, is to compare this criterion sample (which includes respondents and non-respondents) with a sample of 20,000 respondents to see what differences, if any, exist between the two samples due to the low rate of response.

Because the entire sample responded in their freshmen year to an ACE questionnaire, considerable data are available on all non-respondents. By comparing the 10% criterion sample, the sample which best represents the population, with a random sample of the respondent questionnaires we can determine the differences between the "achieved" sample and what would have been obtained if all sampled individuals had returned the questionnaires.

All tables are presented in weighted form (for an explanation of the weighting scheme used on the undergraduate data, refer to page 39). The weights for the achieved sample are constructed in the same manner as the final respondent weights excluding, of course, the institutional non-response factor. The weights for the criterion sample are constructed from the strata weight, correcting for quality and control. All the variables are presented in the following format: variable (e.g. father's education) for the criterion sample; variable for the respondent or achieved sample (currently and not currently enrolled students); variable for currently enrolled respondents; variable for not currently enrolled respondents.²¹ Because of slight differences in the weights for the achieved and criterion samples and rounding error in the computation of the percentages for weighted tables, differences of up to two percentage points should be anticipated between categories of variables in the criterion and in the achieved samples. This poses no analytic problems but does pose a descriptive problem when considering a variable in which a significant category, such as the percentage of black undergraduates, is extremely small to begin with. Users are cautioned, therefore, to consider this when using the data descriptively.

Table 28 shows the number of questionnaires sent out by year of college entrance and the response rate for each cohort. The effect of having older

21. We refer, here, to currently and not currently enrolled entrants as "students" although those who are not currently enrolled are either temporarily or permanently not students.

Table 28

Response Rates by Year Entered
College as a Freshman

	Seniors 1966	Juniors 1967	Sophomores 1968	Freshmen 1969	TOTAL
Number of questionnaires sent out	50,158	48,610	40,217	32,535	171,520*
Number undeliverable	3,756	2,545	1,992	1,103	9,396
Number returned	19,190	18,909	17,611	14,984	70,694*
Response rate	38.3	38.9	43.8	46.1	41.2*

*These figures include only those students included in the Carnegie study of undergraduates. ACE augmented the study with some additional students which accounts for any differences in total which may be published by ACE.

addresses and a higher drop out rate for the older cohorts is a lower response rate among seniors than among freshmen.

Most studies of non-response bias have found that non-response is associated with lower social class and its correlates such as non-white race and attendance at poor quality schools. Here we are not solely concerned with the differences between respondents and non-respondents. Instead the focus is on the differences between a sample in which all the non-respondents are included and one in which they are not. In the analysis which follows we shall try to answer the following questions: What are the differences between the achieved sample (with a 40% response rate) and the criterion sample (with a 100% response rate)? To what degree are demographic variables responsible for these differences? And to what degree are variables associated with the academic careers of undergraduate students the cause of differences in response rates among particular sub-sets of the population? For the latter analysis we will look at quality of the institution entered as a freshman, high school grade point average, intended

major and academic aspirations.

In the undergraduate study the largest potential source of bias is due to the low response rate among individuals who are not currently enrolled in college. The undergraduate sample is a sample of entrants to the nearly 200 institutions, over a four year period. The weighted projections are to the universe of entrants in the four year period. 12% of the achieved sample is made up of students who are not currently enrolled in college. Based on population projections and studies of attrition we estimate that 30% to 35% of the criterion sample were no longer enrolled in college at the time the survey was conducted.²² Using these estimates of attrition, the response rate among currently enrolled students would be approximately 52%, among not currently enrolled it would be approximately 17%.

As we shall see, respondents who are not currently enrolled (NCE) differ considerably from currently enrolled (CE) students. NCE respondents are in lower quality institutions; they are from families with lower socio-economic status; and as entrants they had lower high school grades and lower academic aspirations than CE students. We would anticipate differences, then, between the criterion sample with many NCE non-respondents and the achieved sample with fewer NCE respondents.

Because such a large component of non-response to this study (but by no means the only component) is probably due to enrollment status we can infer certain important characteristics associated with attrition from the analysis of non-response. We can also identify here the kinds of students

22. In a study of attrition among undergraduates, Astin and Panos report that "65% of the students in the population (of entrants from 1961) had completed four or more years of college at the time of the study (1965)." In the same study 44% reported that they had changed college or dropped out for some period since entering their first college. See Robert J. Panos and Alexander W. Astin, "Attrition Among College Students," American Educational Research Journal, vol. V, number 1, January 1968.

Table 29Measure of Socio-Economic Status
of UndergraduatesTable 29-AFather's Educational Attainment

	<u>Criterion Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>C.E. Respondents</u>	<u>N.C.E. Respondents</u>
1-3 years high school or less	25%	22%	22%	28%
High school graduate	29	28	28	29
1-3 years college	19	20	20	21
B.A. or post graduate degree	<u>27</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>22</u>
TOTAL	100	99	100	100
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*	*

Table 29-BMother's Educational Attainment

	<u>Criterion Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>C.E. Respondents</u>	<u>N.C.E. Respondents</u>
1-3 years high school or less	18%	16%	16%	20%
High school graduate	44	43	43	44
1-3 years college	20	21	21	22
B.A. or post graduate degree	<u>18</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>15</u>
TOTAL	100	99	100	101
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*	*

Table 29 [cont.]

Measure of Socio-Economic Status
of Undergraduates

Table 29-C

Total Family Income

	Criterion Sample	Achieved Sample	C.E. Respondents	N.C.E. Respondents
Less than \$6,000	16%	15%	14%	19%
\$6,000 - \$7,999	17	15	15	17
\$8,000 - \$9,999	16	17	16	18
\$10,000 - \$14,999	26	29	29	27
\$15,000 - \$19,999	12	11	12	8
\$20,000 and over	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>12</u>
TOTAL	101	101	101	101
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*	*

Table 29 [cont.]
Measure of Socio-Economic Status
of Undergraduates

Table 29-D

Race

Criterion Sample

White 91%

Non-white $\frac{9\%}{100\%}$

Blacks	49%
Oriental	8%
Other (including Native American)	43%
	<u>100%</u>

Achieved Sample

White 93%

Non-white $\frac{7\%}{100\%}$

Blacks	44%
Oriental	6%
Other (including Native American)	50%
	<u>100%</u>

Currently Enrolled Respondents

White 93%

Non-white $\frac{7\%}{100\%}$

Blacks	43%
Oriental	7%
Other (including Native American)	50%
	<u>100%</u>

Not Currently Enrolled Respondents

White 93%

Non-white $\frac{7\%}{100\%}$

Blacks	50%
Oriental	10%
Other (including Native American)	39%
	<u>99%</u>

and institutions from which a low response rate can be expected in similar research.

As has been shown elsewhere, the most substantial impact of socio-economic status on college attendance occurs prior to college entrance. Thus relatively small differences between the criterion and achieved sample were found on most of the demographic variables related to SES, selected for non-response analysis. As Table 29 indicates, there are small differences in parents' educational attainment between the criterion and achieved sample. The same is true for parents' income. There are, as we can see, more substantial differences between the currently and not currently enrolled respondents. 36% of the NCE respondents report total parents' income of less than \$7,999; 29% of the currently enrolled report this income. These data suggest that non-respondents and not currently enrolled respondents come from families with somewhat lower socio-economic status than currently enrolled respondents but that these differences are reflected in rather small differences between the criterion and achieved sample. from families with somewhat lower socio-economic status than currently enrolled respondents but that these differences are reflected in rather small differences between the criterion and achieved sample.

Table 30

	<u>Sex</u>			
	<u>Criterion Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>C.E. Respondents</u>	<u>N.C.E. Respondents</u>
Male	57	51	52	48
Female	<u>43</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>52</u>
TOTAL	100	100	100	100
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*	*

As Table 29-D indicates, non-whites make up a slightly larger proportion of the criterion than the achieved sample. There is, however, no evidence that non-white students are significantly less likely than whites to respond. 9% of the criterion sample is made up of non-white entrants compared to 7% of the achieved sample. Because the percentage of non-white students is quite small it is difficult to determine response rates for the various non-white groups. Table 29-D indicates that half of the not currently enrolled non-white respondents are black compared to 43% of the currently enrolled non-white respondents. This suggests that the achieved sample with a smaller proportion of NCE respondents may underrepresent blacks.

There is little evidence that women leave college more often than men.^{2,3} Therefore, we would expect any difference between the achieved and criterion sample on this variable to be primarily a function of differential response rates among men and women. Table 30 indicates that 57% of the criterion sample are men compared to 51% of the achieved sample. The underrepresentation of men among both CE and NCE suggests that independent of enrollment status men were less likely to respond to the questionnaire. Although there are no baseline statistics for students not currently enrolled, census figures indicate that 60% of currently enrolled undergraduates are men.

Attrition and non-response are both highly correlated with the quality of the institution, preparation for academic life (measured by high school grades), and academic aspirations. 38% of the criterion sample entered junior colleges compared to 28% of the achieved sample. (See Table 31.)

23. Astin and Ranos, op. cit., report no significant correlation between sex and attrition.

Table 31
Quality of Entering Institution

	<u>Criterion Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>C.E. Respondents</u>	<u>N.C.E. Respondents</u>
High Quality Universities	4%	5%	6%	2%
Medium Quality Universities	9	10	11	7
Low Quality Universities	12	14	14	12
High Quality Colleges	3	4	4	1
Medium Quality Colleges	10	12	12	8
Low Quality Colleges	24	26	27	23
Junior Colleges	38	28	26	47
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	100	99	100	100
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*	*

As we can see here nearly half of the not currently enrolled respondents and only 24% of the CE respondents entered junior college as freshmen.

Both achievement in secondary school and level of aspiration affect the decision-making process leading to the choice of a college. Junior college students, overall, have lower grades and lower aspirations. Having less commitment to and preparation for the academic enterprise, they are more likely to leave college. Tables 32-A and 32-B indicate substantial differences between the currently enrolled and not currently enrolled respondents in the proportion entering college with a B+ or better GPA and aspiring to no higher than a BA degree. These large differences are reflected in smaller, but significant, differences between the criterion and achieved sample. These data suggest that marginal students in lower quality institutions are underrepresented in the achieved sample. The data are consistent with our inference that a substantial proportion of our non-respondents and, therefore, of the criterion sample are no longer attending college.

Table 32-A

<u>High School Grade Point Average</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>C.E. Respondents</u>	<u>N.C.E. Respondents</u>
B+ or above	28%	38%	39%	22%
B	22	25	25	25
C+, B-	33	27	27	33
C	15	9	8	18
Below C	1	-	-	1
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	99	99	99	99
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*	*

Table 32-B

<u>Highest Degree Intend to Obtain</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>C.E. Respondents</u>	<u>N.C.E. Respondents</u>
None or AA	13%	8%	6%	20%
BA	36 <input type="checkbox"/> 49%	35 <input type="checkbox"/> 43%	35 <input type="checkbox"/> 41%	38 <input type="checkbox"/> 58%
MA	33	35	36	26
Ph.D. or Ed.D.	10	12	13	8
M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M.	4	6	6	4
L.L.B. or J.D.	1	-	2	1
Other	3	2	2	3
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	100	98	100	100
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*	*

Table 33Control of Institution: Public/Private

<u>Control</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>	<u>C.E. Respondents</u>	<u>N.C.E. Respondents</u>
Public	74%	70%	69%	76%
Private	26	30	31	24
	—	—	—	—
TOTAL	100	100	100	100
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*	*	*

There is a small, but significant, difference between the achieved and criterion sample on institutional control. 74% of the criterion sample entered a public institution compared to 70% of the achieved sample. This is largely a function of the fact the junior colleges in the sample are predominately public institutions and, as noted, a large proportion of the not currently enrolled entered junior colleges.

Table 34
Intended Major Field

	<u>Criterion Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>
Agriculture	2%	2%
Biology	3	4
Business	16	11
Education	10	12
Engineering	10	9
English	3	4
Health	4	6
History	6	7
Humanities	4	4
Fine Arts	8	7
Mathematics	3	5
Physical Sciences	2	3
Pre-Professional (L.L.B., M.D., D.V.M.)	7	8
Social Sciences	8	9
Technical	3	2
Non-Technical	3	3
Undeclared	7	6
	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	99	102
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	*

As shown in Table 34, overall there are only small differences in intended major field for the criterion and achieved samples. The achieved sample underrepresents business majors, in particular. This, no doubt, is a function of both the underrepresentation of men and junior college students. Among both groups a significant proportion are men. Correspondingly, the achieved sample slightly overrepresents education majors, a field made up predominantly of women.

It is important, at this point, to keep in mind that differences on related variables (non-random differences) between a criterion and achieved sample only occur in the case where a distinct subset of the population (in this case NCE students or men) is coincident with the subset of non-respondents and where both subsets are large. The largest differences, therefore, occur on variables related to academic performance (a strong predictor of persistence in college and therefore of non-response) and sex (a strong predictor of non-response but not persistence). Thus very small differences between respondents and non-respondents will not be apparent using this method of analysis nor are those differences likely to affect analysis of the data.

An 18% difference between CE and NCE respondents in the proportion of students with a B+ or better GPA is reflected in only a 10% difference between the achieved and criterion sample. This is the largest difference between the two samples among the variables examined here. If the quality of the entering institution is controlled, even these differences are greatly minimized. Referring back to Table 31 we find that only 2% of the NCE respondents entered high quality universities, while 47% entered junior colleges. It is also interesting to note that institutional quality, level of aspiration and preparation for academic life appear to play a

larger role than demographic variables, alone, in determining attrition, and, therefore, non-response.

The final weighting procedures for the achieved sample include a component to compensate for response bias. Because of different inter-cohort response rate, each cohort, within an institution, was weighted separately. Table 35 indicates the final weighted distributions on institutional quality, high school grade point average and sex for the criterion and achieved samples. The final weights underrepresent men and poorly prepared students by less than 5%. On measures of SES (not shown) the differences between the criterion and achieved sample for any given category are less than 2%.

Our conclusion is that, at least on those variables which we have available, the weighted achieved sample of undergraduates represents the population from which it was drawn, with the exceptions noted, and that the magnitude of difference between the two samples is quite small.

Table 35
Final Weighted Distributions

A. Quality of Entering Institution (Criterion and Achieved Samples - Final Weights)

<u>Quality</u>	<u>Criterion Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>
High Quality Universities	4%	4%
Medium Quality Universities	9	9
Low Quality Universities	12	12
High Quality Colleges	3	3
Medium Quality Colleges	10	10
Low Quality Colleges	24	24
Junior Colleges	38	38
	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	100	100
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	6,537,869

B. High School Grade Point Average (Criterion and Achieved Samples - Final Weights)

	<u>Criterion Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>
B+ or above	28%	33%
B	22	24
C+, B-	33	31
C	15	11
Below C	1	-
	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	99	99
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	6,537,869

Table 35 [cont.]Final Weighted Distributions

C. Sex (Criterion and Achieved Samples - Final Weights)

	<u>Criterion Sample</u>	<u>Achieved Sample</u>
Male	57%	53%
Female	43	47
	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	100	100
WEIGHTED BASE	6,513,516	6,537,869

Quality Ranking of Institutions

Universities

Institutional quality has proven to be an important control variable. The initial marginals and many later cross tabulations have used institutional quality as a stratifying variable.

The colleges and universities in the sample have been classified on the basis of quality into seven groups: three groups of universities, three groups of four-year colleges, and all junior colleges.

Our university, four-year college, and junior college classification is based on information supplied by the American Council on Education, which information is itself based on the classification scheme developed by the U.S. Office of Education. The Office of Education defines universities as "institutions which give considerable stress to graduate instruction, which confer advanced degrees as well as bachelor's degrees in a variety of liberal arts fields, and which have at least two professional schools that are not exclusively technological." "Four-year colleges" is an "all other" residual category.²⁴ As some users have noted, this definition is "not very precise," yet it is precise enough to exclude from the university category the California Institute of Technology and other technical institutes one expects to find in studies of graduate education.²⁵ Although we have been tempted to move some specialized institutions from the four-year college to the university category, systematic reclassification of institutions would require analysis of our data far beyond the scope of this report. For that

24. Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education: Part A--Summary Data, USGPO, 1969, p. 3.

25. Bernard Berelson, Graduate Education in the United States, McGraw Hill, 1960, pp. 280-281.

matter, since many statistics published by the Office of Education provide reference points for the data presented here, there are obvious advantages to the use of identical definitions, regardless of how unsatisfactory these definitions may be on other grounds.

The basic source of information on quality is The Gourman Report²⁶ which rates "the undergraduate programs of nearly all of the colleges and universities in the United States." Gourman provides three composite ratings for each institution: a rating of the academic departments in terms of such things as accreditation and the proportion of students receiving scholarships and fellowships; a rating of non-departmental aspects of the institution, such as the administration's "commitment to excellence," the level of financial aid available to students, the board of trustees, and faculty morale (e.g. rank, tenure, salary scale, research facilities); and a total institutional rating, which is simply the arithmetic mean of the departmental and non-departmental ratings. The correlation between the departmental and non-departmental ratings is very high ($r=+.956$).²⁷ We decided, therefore, to use institutional rating (which correlates+.99 with departmental rating). As Gourman points out, "the criteria for evaluation of the individual departments are quite complex and take into account many factors." Since the department is only one of many elements of the college or university to which Gourman applies a complex rating scheme, since his ranking criteria are at times idiosyncratic (e.g., "one of the basic criteria" for rating method of instruction is the following assertion: "It has

26. By Jack Gourman, The Continuing Education Institute, Phoenix, 1967.

27. Walter F. Abbott and Calvin F. Schmid, "Toward An Organizational Theory of Migration: University Prestige and First-Time Undergraduate Student Migration in the United States", unpublished ms., p.19.

been long established that a minimum of ten years after college graduation is necessary to produce an excellent teacher in the college classroom."), and since he does not tell us how he combines the rankings of the various elements to produce over-all scores, our justification for using Gourman's scheme is largely pragmatic.

The Gourman method produces results much like those obtained by other, less ambitious, efforts to rank American institutions of higher education. Of the "top 22 universities" listed by Berelson (Graduate Education in the United States), we have 15 in our sample. All 15 of these institutions are found among the top 22 universities in the sample, when sample institutions are ranked according to Gourman scores. Edward Gross and Paul Grambsch, using information supplied by Allen Cartter,²⁸ rate major universities in terms of the quality of their doctoral training programs. Although the Gross-Grambsch index ranks graduate schools, and Gourman ranks undergraduate instruction, the correlation between the two ranking systems based on 79 universities, is .83.²⁹

Abbott and Schmid provide further validation of the Gourman ratings as they apply to the 79 universities rated by Gross and Grambsch:

28. An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education (Washington, D.C.; American Council on Education, 1965).

29. Gross and Grambsch too have three indexes of quality. The correlation reported is between the Gourman total rating and the Gross-Grambsch index based on a "weighted mean of /Cartter/ departmental ratings." (The simplest of the Gross-Grambsch indexes.) See Abbott and Schmid, p. 19.

Correlations Between Selected Measures of University
Quality and Total Gourman Ratings (79 Institutions)

Average compensation of faculty, 1963-64	.78
Number of library volumes	.74
Selectivity	.73
Doctorates conferred, 1861-1962	.71
Percent foreign students	.66

Source: Abbott and Schmid, p. 21.

In short, then, the three categories we use for universities differ little from the gross categories of quality that might be obtained from other well-known quality rankings. Since the Gourman system applies to four-year colleges as well as universities, we have used it here.

The high quality universities score 580 or above on Gourman. In 1968-69 there were 35,118 faculty in these institutions; 13,924 responded to our questionnaire. Of the 114,093 graduate students in these institutions, 10,203 responded to our questionnaire.

The medium quality universities score between 477 and 579 on Gourman. In 1968-69 there were 41,050 faculty in these institutions; 15,475 responded to our questionnaire. Of the 119,486 graduate students, 11,131 responded to the questionnaire.

The low quality universities score less than 477 on Gourman. In 1968-69 there were 30,407 faculty in these institutions; 14,382 responded to our questionnaire. Of the 90,863 graduate students in these universities, 8,230 responded to our questionnaire.

Four-Year Colleges

Grouping of the four-year colleges in our sample is based on a

combination of Gourman rankings and rankings provided by College-Rater,³⁰ with precedence given to the higher of the ratings available for each college. At first glance, College-Rater appears to base its rankings on a strategy very different from that employed by Gourman. In fact, College-Rater appears to have The Gourman Report in mind when it describes its own procedure:

COLLEGE-RATER does not attempt to evaluate the academic excellence of a college or university, the competency of its faculty and staff, or the scope and variety of its curricula. Neither does it profess to measure the efficacy of the operation of its various departments nor the size of its physical plant and endowment. Guidelines used do not take into account the quality of the academic program, the intellectual environment, educational techniques, facilities and other considerations. If such imponderables could be measured, the ratings would change considerably.

In the end, however, Gourman and College-Rater come out with criteria that are much alike and with roughly similar rankings (the correlation between the two sets of scores is +.750). The four major criteria upon which College-Rater scores are based are, in descending order:

SAT/ACT scores of recently enrolled freshman, proportion of faculty with doctorate, faculty salaries, and library collection. As will be recalled from the table presented earlier, three of these variables are strongly correlated with total Gourman scores. (Information on the correlation with the fourth variable, proportion of faculty with doctorate, is not available.)

30. College-Rater, Inc., Allentown, Pennsylvania, 1967.

In terms of clarity and logic of method, the College-Rater system is decidedly superior to Gourman's. In terms of outcome, in our judgment, College-Rater does better than Gourman in the ranking of four-year colleges; it does less well in the ranking of universities. (As is to be expected: College-Rater explicitly avoids the subjective judgments that are the basis of most ratings of graduate schools, including our own.)

The top quality colleges score 445 or above on Gourman or 719 and above on College-Rater. In 1968-69 there were 8,820 faculty in these institutions; 4,648 responded to our questionnaire. Of the 20,733 graduate students, 1,640 responded to the questionnaire.

The middle quality colleges score between 378 and 444 on Gourman and between 550 and 718 on College-Rater. In 1968-69 there were 8,396 faculty in these institutions; 4,801 responded to our questionnaire. Of the 14,809 graduate students, 1,062 responded.

The low quality colleges score less than 378 on Gourman and less than 550 on College-Rater. In 1968-69 there were 8,952 faculty in these institutions; 4,801 responded to the questionnaire. Of the 17,056 graduate students, 699 responded to the questionnaire.

All junior colleges were treated as one category. In 1968-69 there were 4,228 faculty in these institutions; 2,140 responded to the questionnaire.

A listing of the universe of universities and colleges, within each of our quality categories, is given on the following pages. Our sample institutions were drawn from this list, but obviously only a portion of the institutions on the list was sampled.

QUALITY I INSTITUTIONS

BRANDEIS UNIVERSITY
CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV
CLEMSON U-ALL CAMPS
CLEMSON UNIV-MAIN CAMPU
CLEMSON UNIV GREENVL BR
CLEMSON UNIV SUMTER BR
COLUMBIA UNIV MAIN DIV
COLUMBIA U TCHRS COL
CORNELL UNIV MAIN CAMPU
CORNELL U MED COL
CORNELL U NURSING
DUKE UNIVERSITY
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
J HPKNS-ADV INST STU
JOHNS HOPKINS U MAIN CA
MASS INST OF TECHNOLOGY
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
RICE UNIVERSITY
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
TULANE UNIV OF LOUISIAN
U ILL MED CTR CHICAG
U OF CAL BERKELEY
U OF CAL LOS ANGELES
U OF MINN MNPLS ST PAUL
U OF WIS ALL CAMPS
U OF WIS MADISON
U OF WIS TWO-YR CAMPUSE
U OF WIS U EXTEN
U OF WIS GREEN BAY
U OF WIS PARKSIDE
UNIV OF PENNSYLVANIA
UNIV OF ILL MAIN CAMPUS
UNIV OF NC AT CHAPEL HI
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTO
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAM
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER
V ILL ALL CAM
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
YALE UNIVERSITY
YESHIVA UNIV MAIN CAMPU

QUALITY II INSTITUTIONS

AUBURN UNIV ALL CAM
 AUBURN UNIV MAIN CAM
 AUBURN U MTGOMERY
 BOSTON UNIVERSITY
 CASE WESTERN RESERVE UN
 CATHOLIC UNIV OF AMERIC
 CUNY CITY COLLEGE
 CUNY FRESHMN PROG GRD C
 CUNY - GRADUATE CNTR
 CUNY U CTR SEEK PRG
 D T WATSN SCH PHYSIA
 EMORY UNIV-ALL CAMP
 EMORY UNIVERSITY
 EMORY UNI-OXFORD COL
 GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
 IND U DOWNTWN INDPLS BR
 IND UNIV INDIANAPOLIS
 IND UNIV KOKOMO
 IND UNIV SOUTH BEND
 IND UNIV FT WAYNE
 IND UNIV NTHWEST CAMPUS
 IND UNIV STHESTRN CAMPU
 INDIANA UNIV-ALL CMP
 INDIANA UNIV-MAIN CAMPU
 IOWA ST U OF SCI + TECH
 LA ST U MAIN CAMPUS
 LA ST U AT ALEXANDRIA
 LA ST U MED C N ORLE
 LA ST U AT NEW ORLEANS
 LA ST U AT EUNICE
 LA ST U AT SHREVEPORT
 MICH ST UNIV MAIN CAMPU
 NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
 OHIO ST-WRIGHT FLD' B
 OHIO ST U MANSFIELD BR
 OHIO ST U LIMA BR
 OHIO ST U MARION BR
 OHIO ST U NEWARK BR
 OHIO ST U-ALL CAMPS
 OHIO ST UNIV MAIN CAMPU
 OHIO UNIV-ALL CAMPS
 OHIO UNIV IRONTON BR
 OHIO UNIV LANCASTER BR
 OHIO UNIV BELMONT CO BR
 PA ST U-HERSHY MD CT
 PA ST U NEW KENSINGTON C
 PA ST U-CAPITOL CAM
 PA ST U-KNG PRSA GRD

PENN ST UNIV MAIN CAMPU
 PENN ST U BEAVER CAMPUS
 PENN ST U DUBOIS CAMPUS
 PENN ST U FAYETTE CAMPU
 PENN ST U SCRANTON CAMP
 PENN ST UNIV ALTOONA CA
 PENN ST UNIV HAZLETON C
 PENN ST U MCKEESPORT CA
 PENN ST U SCHUYLKILL CA
 PENN ST U WILKES-BAR CA
 PENN ST U BEHREND CAM
 PENN ST U BERKS CENTER
 PENN ST U MOUNT ALTO
 PENN ST U OGONTZ CAM
 PENN ST U SHNANGO VLY C
 PENN ST U YORK
 PENN ST U ALLENTOWN CAM
 PENN ST U DELAWARE CAMP
 PURDUE UNIV-ALL CAMP
 PURDUE UNIV MAIN CAMPUS
 PURDUE U INDPLS REG CMP
 PURDUE UNIV HAMMOND
 PURDUE U MICHIGAN CITY
 PURDUE UNIV FT WAYNE
 RENSSELAER POLY MAIN CA
 RENSSELAER POLY I-CONN
 RUTGERS THE ST U MAIN C
 RUTGERS UNIV DOUGLAS CO
 RUTGERS U-UNIV COLL
 ST L U PARKS COL AERO T
 ST LOUIS U-ALL CAMP
 ST LOUIS U MAIN CAMPUS
 SUNY ST U BUF MAIN CAMP
 SYRACUSE U MAIN CAMPUS
 SYRACUSE UNIV UTICA COL
 TEXAS A + M UNIVERSITY
 TUFTS UNIVERSITY
 U CINCINNATI MAIN CAMPU
 U CINCINNATI BLUE ASH B
 U CIN-TRI CO ACDMC C
 U OF CINCINNATI-ALL
 U OF CAL DAVIS
 U OF CHASTINGS
 U OF CAL IRVINE
 U OF CAL SAN DIEGO
 U OF CAL RIVERSIDE
 U OF CAL SAN FRANCISCO
 U OF CAL SANTA CRUZ

QUALITY II INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

U OF CAL SANTA BARBARA
 U OF MD-BALT PROF SC
 U OF PITTSBGH BRADFORD C
 U OF PITTSBGH GRENSBG C
 U OF PITTSBGH JOHNSTWN C
 U OF PITTSBGH TITUSVLE C
 U OF VA EASTERN SHORE B
 U TEX DENT BR HOUSTN
 U TEX MED BR GALVSTN
 U TEX MED SCH DALLAS
 U TEX NURSING SCH
 U TEX SCH PUB HEALTH
 U TX GRAD SCH-BIOMED
 U TX MD SCH-SN ANTON
 UNI OREGON-MED SCH
 UNI OREGON-DENT SCH
 UNIV COLO MAIN CAMPUS
 UNIV COLO MED CTR
 UNIV COLO COLO SPRINGS
 UNIV COLO DENVER CTR
 UNIV MD MAIN CAMPUS
 UNIV MD BALTIMORE CO CA
 UNIV MISSOURI AT COLUMB
 UNIV OKLA MAIN CAMPUS
 UNIV OF OK-OKLA CITY
 UNIV OREGON-ALL CAMP
 UNIV OREGON MAIN CAMPUS
 UNIV OF STHRN CALIFORNI
 UNIV PITTSBURG-ALL C
 UNIV PITTSBG MAIN CAMP
 UNIV TEXAS AT AUSTIN
 UNIV VIRGINIA MAIN CAMP
 UNIV VA CLINCH VALLEY C
 UNIV VA GEO MASON COLLE
 UNIV VA PATRICK HENRY B
 UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
 UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIF
 UNIVERSITY OF DENVER
 UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
 UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
 UNIVERSITY OF IOWA
 UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
 WASHINGTON STATE UNIV
 WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
 WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

QUALITY III INSTITUTIONS

ADELPHI UNIV MAIN CAMPUS
 ADELPHI U ADEL-SUFFOLK
 AMERICAN UNIVERSITY
 ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
 ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
 BAYLOR U-COL DENTIST
 BAYLOR U-MEDICAL COL
 BAYLOR UNIV MAIN CAMPUS
 BOSTON COL MAIN CAMPUS
 BOWL GRN ST U-FIRELD
 BOWLING GREEN ST U BRYA
 BOWLING GRN ST U FREMON
 BOWLING GRN ST U MAIN C
 BOWLING GRN ST U FOSTORI
 BOWLING GRN ST U SANDUSK
 BRADLEY UNIVERSITY
 BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY
 BUTLER UNIVERSITY
 COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY
 CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY
 DEPAUL UNIVERSITY
 DRAKE UNIVERSITY
 DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY
 FLORIDA A + M UNIVERSITY
 FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY
 FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
 GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIV
 HOWARD UNIVERSITY
 KANSAS ST U AG + APP SC
 KENT ST U-ELYRIA
 KENT ST U GEauga
 KENT ST U ORVILLE
 KENT ST U SALEM
 KENT ST U WADSWORTH
 KENT ST U ASHTABULA
 KENT ST U CANTON
 KENT ST U E LIVERPOOL
 KENT ST U TUSCARAWAS
 KENT ST U WARREN
 KENT ST UNIV MAIN CAMPUS
 LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
 LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
 MARQUETTE-SCH MEDIC
 MARQUETTE U MAIN CAMPUS
 MIAMI U-MIDDLETWN BR
 MIAMI U-HAMILTON BR
 MIAMI UNI-ALL CAMPS
 MIAMI UNIV OXFORD CAMPUS
 MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIV
 MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY

N C ST U RALEIGH MAIN C
 N CAR ST U-FT BRASS
 N MEX ST U-FARMINGTN
 NEW MEX ST U UNIV PARK
 NEW MEX ST U-CARLSBD
 NEW MEX ST U ALAMO GORDO
 NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIV
 NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIV
 NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIV
 NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
 OKLA ST UNIV MAIN CAMPUS
 OKLA ST UNIV OKMULGEE
 OKLA ST UNIV OKLA CITY
 OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
 PRATT INSTITUTE
 RUTGERS UNIV CAMDEN
 RUTGERS UNIV NEWARK
 SETON HALL UNIVERSITY
 SOUTH DAKOTA STATE UNIV
 SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIV
 ST JOHNS UNIVERSITY
 STHRN ILL CARBUNDALE
 STHRN ILL EDWARDSVLL
 TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
 TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIV
 TEXAS TECH UNIV
 TEXAS WOMANS UNIVERSITY
 U ALAS ANCHORAGE CMTY C
 U ALAS JUNEAU DS C C
 U ALAS KETCHIKAN C C
 U ALAS SITKA C C
 U ALAS KENAI PEN C C
 U ALAS KODIAK C C
 U ALAS MATNU SUS C C
 U HAWA HONOLULU CMTY CO
 U HAWA KAUAI TECH SCH
 U HAWA KAPIOLANI CMTY C
 U HAWA MAUI CMTY COL
 U HAWA LEEWRD OAHU C
 U MINN TECH INST CROOKS
 U NEBR-COL MED-OMAHA
 U OF MINN DULUTH
 U OF MINN MORRIS
 U OF WIS MILWAUKEE
 U PUERTO RICO RIO PIEDR
 U PUERTO RICO MAYAGUEZ
 U PUERTO RICO SAN JUAN
 U TENN-MARTIN
 U TENN-MEMPHIS
 U TENN NASHVILLE
 UNI MISS MEDICAL CTR

QUALITY III INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

UNIV ALABAMA MAIN CAMPU	UNIV S C AIKEN
UNIV ALASKA MAIN CAMPUS	UNIV S C SPARTANBURG
UNIV ARK MAIN CAMPUS	UNIV TENN-KNOXVILLE
UNIV ARK MED CTR	UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
UNIV CONN ALL CAMPSS	UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
UNIV CONN SOUTHEASTERN	UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
UNIV HAWAII MAIN CAMPUS	UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO
UNIV HAWAII HILO	UNIVERSITY OF TULSA
UNIV KY MAIN CAMPUS	UNIVERSITY OF PORTLAND
UNIV KY CMTY COL SYSTEM	UNIVERSITY SOUTH DAKOTA
UNIV MAINE MAIN CAMPUS	UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
UNIV MAINE AT PORTLAND	UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI
UNIV MASS AMHERST CAMPU	UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO
UNIV MASS BOSTON CAMPUS	UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILL
UNIV MISS-ALL CAMPUS	UNIVERSITY OF DETROIT
UNIV MISS MAIN CAMPUS	UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA
UNIV MISSOURI AT KANS C	UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXIC
UNIV MISSOURI AT ROLLA	UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIV MISSOURI AT ST LOU	UTAH ST U - SNOW COL
UNIV NEBRASKA MAIN CAMP	VA POLY INST MAIN CAMPU
UNIV NEVADA MAIN CAMPUS	VA POLY INST DANVILLE
UNIV N DAK MAIN CAMPUS	VILLANOVA UNIVERSITY
UNIV N DAK ELLENDALE CT	W VA UNIV-ALL CAMPS
UNIV N DAK WILLISTON	W VA U PARKERSBURG
UNIV OF UTAH MAIN CAMPU	WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY
UNIV OF VT + ST AGRIC C	WICHITA STATE UNIVERSIT
UNIV OF RHODE ISLAND	
UNIV OF ALA HUNTSVILLE	
UNIV OF ALA BIRMINGHAM	
UNIV OF CONN MAIN CAMPU	
UNIV OF CONN HARTFORD	
UNIV OF CONN STAMFORD	
UNIV OF CONN TORRINGTON	
UNIV OF CONN WATERBURY	
UNIV OF MAINE-AGUSTA	
UNIV OF NEW HAMPSHIRE	
UNIV PR HUMACAO REG COL	
UNIV PR CAYEY REG COL	
UNIV PR ARECIBO REG COL	
UNIV R I-ALL CAMPUS	
UNIV R I-DIV UNI EXT	
UNIV S C-ALL CAMPUS	
UNIV S C MAIN CAMPUS	
UNIV S C BEAUFORT	
UNIV S C CONWAY	
UNIV S C LANCASTER	
UNIV S C FLORENCE	
UNIV S C UNION	
UNIV S C ALLENDALE	

QUALITY IV INSTITUTIONS

AMHERST COLLEGE
 ANTIOCH-PTNY GR S ED
 ANTIOCH COLL-ALL CAM
 ANTIOCH COL MAIN CAMPUS
 AUGUSTANA COLLEGE
 BELoit COLLEGE
 BERNARD BARUCH) CUNY*
 BOWDOIN COLLEGE
 BROWN UNIVERSITY
 BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
 CALIFORNIA ST COL HAYWA
 CALIFORNIA INST OF TECH
 CARLETON COLLEGE
 CHRSTPHR NWPT COL WM MA
 CLAREMONT UNIV CNTR
 CLAREMONT MENS COLLEGE
 CLARK UNIVERSITY
 COL WM + MARY MAIN CAMP
 COLGATE UNIVERSITY
 COLLEGE OF WOOSTER
 COLORADO COLLEGE
 COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINE
 COLUMBIA UNIV BARNARD C
 CONNECTICUT COLLEGE
 COOPER UNION
 CUNY BROOKLYN COLLEGE
 CUNY HUNTER COLLEGE
 CUNY - LEHMAN COLL
 CUNY - RICHMOND COLL
 CUNY JHN JAY COL CRIM J
 CUNY MT SINAI SCH MD
 CUNY YORK COLLEGE
 DARTMOUTH COLLEGE
 DAVIDSON COLLEGE
 DENISON UNIVERSITY
 DEPAUW UNIVERSITY
 DICKINSON COLLEGE
 DICKINSON SCH OF LAW
 DREW UNIVERSITY
 EARLHAM COLLEGE
 FRANKLIN + MARSHALL COL
 FRESNO ST COL BKRSFLD
 FRESNO ST COL MAIN CAMP
 FURMAN UNIVERSITY
 GA INST TECH MAIN CAMPUS
 GRINNELL COLLEGE
 HAMILTON COLLEGE
 HARVEY MUDD COLLEGE
 HAVERFORD COLLEGE
 ILLINOIS INST OF TECH

IND UNIV ESTRN IND CTR
 INST PAPER CHEM-L U
 KALAMAZOO COLLEGE
 KENYON COLLEGE
 KNOX COLLEGE
 LAFAYETTE COLLEGE
 LAWRENCE UNIV MAIN CAMP
 LEHIGH UNIVERSITY
 MACALESTER COLLEGE
 MIDDLEBURY COLLEGE
 MILLS COLLEGE
 MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE
 NEW COLLEGE
 OBERLIN COLLEGE
 OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE
 OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSIT
 PITZER COLLEGE
 POLYTECHNIC INST BROOKL
 POMONA COLLEGE
 REED COLLEGE
 RICHARD BLAND COL WM MA
 S DIEGO ST CALEXICO
 SAN DIEGO ST COL MAIN C
 SAN FRANCISCO STATE COL
 SMITH COLLEGE
 SOUTHRN TECH INST GATE
 SOUTHWESTERN AT MEMPHIS
 ST OLAF COLLEGE
 STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TE
 SUNY COL FORSTRY MAIN C
 SUNY COL CERAMCS ALFRED
 SUNY COL OF AG AT CORNL
 SUNY COL HOME EC CORNEL
 SUNY DWNSTATE MED CR
 SUNY HLTH SCI CTR BU
 SUNY IND LABR REL CORNL
 SUNY STATE UNIV BINGHAM
 SUNY STATE U STONY BRK
 SUNY UPSTATE MED CTR
 SUNY VET COL CORNELL
 SWARTHMORE COLLEGE
 TRINITY COLLEGE
 U S COAST GUARD ACADEMY
 U S MERCHANT MARINE ACA
 U S MILITARY ACADEMY
 U S NAVAL ACADEMY
 UNION COLLEGE
 UNIV OF SAN FRANCISCO
 UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH
 UNIVERSITY OF SANTA CLA

QUALITY IV INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

VASSAR COLLEGE
WABASH COLLEGE
WASHINGTON + LEE UNIV
WEBB INST OF NAVAL ARCH
WELLESLEY COLLEGE
WELLS COLLEGE
WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
WHITMAN COLLEGE
WILLIAMS COLLEGE
WORCESTER POLY INSTITUT

EASTERN OREGON COLLEGE
EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIV
ELMHURST COLLEGE
ELMIRA COLLEGE
EMMANUEL COLLEGE
EMORY + HENRY COLLEGE
FISK UNIVERSITY
FLORIDA PRESBYTERIAN CO
FRIENDS UNIVERSITY
GALLAUDET COLLEGE
GEORGE PEABODY COL TCHR
GEORGETOWN COLLEGE
GEORGIA STATE COLLEGE
GETTYSBURG COLLEGE
GODDARD COLLEGE
GONZAGA UNIVERSITY
GORDON COLLEGE
GOSHEN COL + BIBLICAL S
GOUCHER COLLEGE
GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLE
GWYNEDD-MERCY COLLEGE
HAMLINE UNIVERSITY
HAMPDEN SYDNEY COLLEGE
HANOVER COLLEGE
HEIDELBERG COLLEGE
HILLSDALE COLLEGE
HIRAM COLLEGE
HOBART + WM SMITH COLLE
HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY
HOLLINS COLLEGE
HOOD COLLEGE
HOPE COLLEGE
HOWARD PAYNE COLLEGE
HUMBOLDT STATE COLLEGE
ILLINOIS COLLEGE
ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSI
ILLINOIS WESLEYAN UNIV
IMMACULATE HEART COLLEG
ITHACA COLLEGE
JAMESTOWN COLLEGE
JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
JUNIATA COLLEGE
KING COLLEGE
LA SALLE COLLEGE
LAKE FOREST COLLEGE
LAMAR STATE COL TECH
LE MOYNE COLLEGE
LEBANON VALLEY COLLEGE
LEWIS + CLARK COLLEGE
LG IS U MERRIWEATHER CA

QUALITY V INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

LG IS U BROOKLN COL PHA
 LG IS U SOUTHAMPTON COL
 LG IS U UNIV CENTER
 LINFIELD COLLEGE
 LORAS COLLEGE
 LOUISIANA POLY INSTITUT
 LOYOLA U LOS ANG MAIN C
 LUTHER COLLEGE
 MACMURRAY COLLEGE
 MANCHESTER COLLEGE
 MANHATTANVILLE COLLEGE
 MANKATO STATE COLLEGE
 MARIETTA COLLEGE
 MARLBORO COLLEGE
 MARY BALDWIN COLLEGE
 MARYGROVE COLLEGE
 MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSIT
 MICH TECH U MAIN CAMPUS
 MICH TEC U LK SUP ST CO
 MILLIKIN UNIVERSITY
 MILLSAPS COLLEGE
 MISSISSIPPI COLLEGE
 MONMOUTH COLLEGE
 MONMOUTH COLLEGE
 MONT COL MINRL SCI + TE
 MONTCLAIR STATE COLLEGE
 MORAVIAN COL MAIN CAMPU
 MORAVIAN COL THEO SM
 MORNINGSIDE COLLEGE
 MOUNT UNION COLLEGE
 MUHLENBERG COLLEGE
 MUNDELEIN COLLEGE
 MUSKINGUM COLLEGE
 N MEX INST MINING + TEC
 NAZARETH COL OF ROCHEST
 NEWARK COL OF ENGINEERI
 NEWTON COL SACRED HEART
 NORTH CENTRAL COLLEGE
 NORTH PARK COL + THEO S
 NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIV
 NORWICH UNIVERSITY
 O NTHRN-RIVERSD HOSP
 OAKLAND UNIVERSITY
 OH NTHRN U WSTRN OH ED
 OH NTHRN UNI-ALL CAM
 OHIO NTHRN U MAIN CAMPU
 OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSIT
 OREGON COLLEGE OF EDUC
 OTTERBEIN COLLEGE

P M C COLLEGES
 PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIV
 PARSONS COLLEGE
 PHILLIPS UNIVERSITY
 PRINCIPIA COLLEGE
 RANDOLPH MACON COLLEGE
 RANDOLPH MACON WOMANS C
 RIDER COLLEGE
 RIPON COLLEGE
 ROCKFORD COLLEGE
 ROLLINS COLL-ALL CMP
 ROLLINS COL MAIN CAMPUS
 ROLLINS COL PATRICK
 ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY
 ROSE POLYTECHNIC INST
 ROSEMONT COLLEGE
 RUSSELL SAGE MAIN CAMPU
 RUSSELL SAGE JC OF ALBA
 S DAK SCH MINES + TECH
 SACRAMENTO STATE COLLEG
 SAN FERNANDO VLY ST COL
 SAN FRANCISCO COL WOMEN
 SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE
 SARAH LAWRENCE COLLEGE
 SCRIPPS COLLEGE
 SEATTLE PACIFIC COLLEGE
 SEATTLE UNIVERSITY
 SETON HILL COLLEGE
 SHIMER COLLEGE
 SIMMONS COLLEGE
 SIMPSON COLLEGE
 SKIDMORE COL MAIN CAMPU
 SKIDMORE COL HOSP BR
 SLIPPERY ROCK STATE COL
 SOUTHERN CONN STATE COL
 SOUTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
 SPRINGFIELD COLLEGE
 ST FRANCIS COLLEGE
 ST JOHNS COL MAIN CAMPU
 ST JOHNS COL SANTA FE N
 ST JOHNS UNIVERSITY
 ST LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY
 ST MARYS COL CALIFORNIA
 ST MARYS COLLEGE
 ST XAVIER COLLEGE
 STEPHEN F AUSTIN ST COL
 STETSON UNIVERSITY
 STONEHILL COLLEGE
 SUNY COLLEGE FREDONIA

QUALITY V INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

SUNY COLLEGE NEW PALTZ
SUNY COLLEGE ONEONTA
SUNY COLLEGE OSWEGO
SUNY STATE UNIV ALBANY
SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY
SWEET BRIAR COLLEGE
TEX LUTH COLL-ALL CP
TEX LUTH COL MAIN CAMPUS
TRANSYLVANIA COLLEGE
TRINITY UNIVERSITY
TRINITY COLLEGE
TUSCULUM COLLEGE
U S AIR FORCE ACADEMY
UNIV OF TEXAS AT EL PASO
UNIV OF PUGET SOUND
UNIV OF CHATTANOOGA
UNIV OF STHRN MISSISSIP
UNIV OF N C AT GREENSBORO
UNIV STHWSTRN LOUISIANA
UNIVERSITY OF DALLAS
UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
UNIVERSITY OF REDLANDS
UNIVERSITY OF BRIDGEPORT
UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD
UPSALA COLLEGE
URSINUS COLLEGE
VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY
VIRGINIA MILITARY INST
WASHINGTON JEFFERSON CO
WASHINGTON COLLEGE
WEBER STATE COLLEGE
WESTERN WASHINGTON ST C
WESTERN ILLINOIS UNIV
WESTERN MARYLAND COLLEGE
WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIV
WESTMINSTER COLLEGE
WESTMONT COLLEGE
WHEATON COLLEGE
WHEATON COLLEGE
WILKES COLLEGE
WILLAMETTE UNIVERSITY
WILSON COLLEGE
WIS STATE UNIV LA CROSSE
WIS STATE UNIV OSHKOSH
WIS STATE UNIV STEVENS P
WIS STATE UNIV SUPERIOR
WIS STATE UNIV PLATTEVILLE
WITTENBERG UNIVERSITY
WOFFORD COLLEGE
XAVIER UNIVERSITY

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS

ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
 ACAD OF THE NEW CHURCH
 ADAMS STATE COLLEGE
 AGRIC + TECH COL OF N C
 AGRIC MECH + NORMAL COL
 ALABAMA A + M COLLEGE
 ALABAMA COLLEGE
 ALABAMA STATE COLLEGE
 ALASKA METHODIST UNIV
 ALBANY COL OF PHARMACY
 ALBANY STATE COLLEGE
 ALCORN A + M COLLEGE
 ALDERSON BROADBUSH COLLEGE
 ALLENTOWN COL ST FR D SA
 ALLEN UNIVERSITY
 ALLIANCE COLLEGE
 ALMA WHITE COLLEGE
 ALVERNIA COLLEGE
 ALVERNO COLLEGE
 AMERICAN CONS OF MUSIC
 AMERICAN INTERNATL COL
 ANDERSON COLLEGE
 ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
 ANGELO STATE COLLEGE
 ANNA MARIA COL FOR WOMEN
 ANNHURST COLLEGE
 APPALACHIAN ST UNIVERSITY
 AQUINAS COLLEGE
 ARIZ BIB COL OF BIOLA C
 ARK ST UNIV MAIN CAMPUS
 ARK ST UNIV BEEBE BRANCH
 ARKANSAS BAPTIST COLLEGE
 ARKANSAS A + M COLLEGE
 ARKANSAS COLLEGE
 ARKANSAS POLYTECHNIC COL
 ARMSTRONG COL
 ARMSTRONG STATE COLLEGE
 AROOSTOOK STATE COLLEGE
 ART ACAD OF CINCINTI
 ART CENTER COL OF DESIG
 ASBURY COLLEGE
 ASBURY THEO SEM
 ASHEVILLE BILTMORE COL
 ASSUMPTION COLLEGE
 ATHENAEUM OF OHIO
 ATHENS COLLEGE
 ATLANTA CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

ATLANTIC UNION COLLEGE
 ATLANTIC CHRISTIAN COL
 AUGUSTA COLLEGE
 AUGUSTINIAN COL MERMAC V
 AURORA COLLEGE
 AUSTIN PEAY STATE UNIV
 AVILA COLLEGE
 AZUSA PACIFIC COLLEGE
 BABSON INST OF BUS ADMI
 BAKER UNIVERSITY
 BALL STATE UNIVERSITY
 BALTIMORE COL-COMMRC
 BALTIMORE HEBREW COL
 BANGOR THEO SEM
 BAPTIST BIBLE SEM INC
 BAPTIST COL-CHARLSTN
 BARBER-SCOTIA COLLEGE
 BARD COLLEGE
 BARRINGTON COLLEGE
 BARRY COLLEGE
 BARTLESVILLE WSLYAN C
 BEAVER COLLEGE
 BELHAVEN COLLEGE
 BELKNAP COLLEGE
 BELLARMIN (-URSULIN)
 BELL-URS ST THOS SEM
 BELMONT ABBEY COLLEGE
 BELMONT COLLEGE
 BENEDICT COLLEGE
 BENJAMIN FRANKLIN UNIV
 BENNETT COLLEGE
 BENTLEY COLLEGE ACC + F
 BERKSHIRE CHRISTIAN COL
 BERRY COLLEGE
 BETHANY BIBLE COLLEGE
 BETHANY LUTH COL + THEO
 BETHANY NAZARENE COLLEGE
 BETHEL COLLEGE
 BETHEL COLLEGE INC
 BETHEL COLLEGE + SEMINA
 BETHUNE COOKMAN COLLEGE
 BIOLA COLLEGE MAIN CAMP
 BISCAYNE COLLEGE INC
 BISHOP COLLEGE
 BLACK HILLS STATE COLLEGE
 BLACKBURN COLLEGE
 BLISS COLLEGE
 BLOOMFIELD COLLEGE
 BLOOMSBURG STATE COLLEGE
 BLUE MOUNTAIN COLLEGE

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

BLUEFIELD STATE COLLEGE
 BLUFFTON COLLEGE
 BOB JONES UNIVERSITY
 BOISE STATE COLLEGE
 BORROMEO SEM OF OHIO
 BOSTON CONS OF MUSIC
 BOWIE STATE COLLEGE
 BRENAU COLLEGE
 BRENTWOOD COLLEGE
 BRESCIA COLLEGE
 BRIAR CLIFF COLLEGE
 BRIARCLIFF COLLEGE
 BRIDGEPORT ENGR INST
 BRIDGEWATER COLLEGE
 BRYANT COLLEGE OF BUS A
 BUENA VISTA COLLEGE
 CABRINI COLLEGE
 CAL ST COL DOMINGUEZ HL
 CAL ST COL SAN BERNARDI
 CALDWELL COL FOR WOMEN
 CALIF COL OF ARTS + CRA
 CALIF INST OF THE ARTS
 CALIF STATE COL FULLERT
 CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE
 CALIFORNIA BAPTIST COL
 CALIFORNIA LUTHERAN COL
 CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACA
 CALVARY BIBLE COLLEGE
 CALVIN COLLEGE
 CAMPBELLSVILLE COLLEGE
 CAMPBELL COLLEGE
 CANAAN COLL
 CAPITOL INST OF TECH
 CARDINAL STRITCH COLLEGE
 CARDINAL CUSHING COLLEGE
 CARDINAL GLENNON COLLEGE
 CARROLL COLLEGE
 CARSON NEWMAN COLLEGE
 CARTHAGE COLLEGE
 CASCADE COLLEGE
 CASTLETON STATE COLLEGE
 CATAWBA COLLEGE
 CATH COL IMMAC CONCEPTI
 CATHERINE SPALDING COL
 CATHOLIC UNIV OF P R
 CATHOLIC TEACHER COL
 CEDAR CREST COLLEGE
 CEDARVILLE COLL
 CEN MO ST COL INDEPENDN
 CENTENARY COLLEGE
 CENTRAL BIBLE COLLEGE

CENTRAL CONN STATE COL
 CENTRAL METHODIST COLLEGE
 CENTRAL STATE COLLEGE
 CENTRAL STATE UNIVERSIT
 CENTRAL UNIV OF IOWA
 CENTRAL WASHINGTON ST C
 CENTRAL WESLEYAN COLLEGE
 CENTRL MO ST C-ALL C
 CENTRL MO ST COL MAIN C
 CHADRON STATE COLLEGE
 CHAMINADE COL OF HONOLU
 CHAPMAN COLLEGE
 CHESTNUT HILL COLLEGE
 CHEYNEY STATE COLLEGE
 CHICAGO STATE COLLEGE
 CHICAGO TECHNICAL COLLEGE
 CHRISTIAN BROTHERS COL
 CINCINNATI BIBLE SEM
 CLAFLIN COLLEGE
 CLARION ST COL MAIN CAM
 CLARK COLLEGE
 CLARKE COLLEGE
 CLEARY COLLEGE
 CLEVELAND INST OF ART
 CLEVELAND INST OF MUSIC
 CLEVELAND STATE UNIV
 CLRION ST COL VENANGO C
 COKER COLLEGE FOR WOMEN
 COL MT ST JOSEPH ON OHI
 COL OF MOUNT ST VINCENT
 COL OF NOTRE DAME OF MD
 COL OF OUR LADY OF ELMS
 COL OF THE SACRED HEART
 COL ST JOS THE PROVIDER
 COL ST ROSE MAIN CAMPUS
 COLBY JR COL FOR WOMEN
 COLGTE ROCHSTR-DIV S
 COLL OF ARTESIA
 COLL OF JEWISH STUDS
 COLL OF THE SOUTHWEST
 COLLEGE MISERICORDIA
 COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN UTA
 COLLEGE OF GUAM
 COLLEGE OF CHARLESTON
 COLLEGE OF THE OZARKS
 COLLEGE OF NOTRE DAME
 COLLEGE OF IDAHO
 COLLEGE OF ST FRANCIS
 COLLEGE OF EMPORIA
 COLLEGE OF ST BENEDICT
 COLLEGE OF ST CATHERINE

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

COLLEGE OF ST SCHOLASTI
 COLLEGE OF ST TERESA
 COLLEGE OF ST THOMAS
 COLLEGE OF GREAT FALLS
 COLLEGE OF ST MARY
 COLLEGE OF ST ELIZABETH
 COLLEGE OF SANTA FE
 COLLEGE OF INSURANCE
 COLLEGE OF STEUBENVILLE
 COLORADO WSTRN COLL
 COLUMBIA BIBLE COLLEGE
 COLUMBIA COLLEGE
 COLUMBIA COLLEGE
 COLUMBIA UNION COLLEGE
 COLUMBIA UNIV COL PHARM
 COLUMBUS COL ART + DESI
 COMBS COLLEGE OF MUSIC
 CONCORD COLLEGE
 CONCORDIA COL MOORHEAD
 CONCORDIA COL ST PAUL
 CONCORDIA TEACHERS COL
 CONVERSE COLLEGE
 COPPIN STATE COLLEGE
 COVENANT COLLEGE
 CULVER STOCKTON COLLEGE
 CUMBERLAND COLLEGE
 CURRY COLLEGE
 D C TEACHERS COLLEGE
 D YOUVILLE COLLEGE
 DAKOTA WESLEYAN UNIV
 DANA COLLEGE
 DANIEL PAYNE COLLEGE
 DAVIS + ELKINS COLLEGE
 DEFIANCE COLLEGE
 DEL VAL COL OF SCI + AG
 DELAWARE STATE COLLEGE
 DELTA STATE COLLEGE
 DETROIT BIBLE COLLEGE
 DETROIT COL OF BUSINESS
 DETROIT INSTITUTE OF TE
 DICKINSON STATE COLLEGE
 DILLARD UNIVERSITY
 DIOCESAN SISTERS COL
 DIV OF CONTINUING ED
 DOANE COLLEGE
 DOMINICAN COLLEGE RACIN
 DOMINICAN COL SAN RAFAE
 DOMINICAN COL OF BLAUVE
 DON BOSCO COLLEGE
 DORDT COLLEGE
 DOWLING COLL

DR MARTIN LUTHER COL
 DRAKE COL OF FLORIDA
 DRURY COLLEGE
 DUCHESNE COL SACRED HEA
 DUNBARTON COL HOLY CROS
 DUNS SCOTUS COLLEGE
 DYKE COLLEGE
 E CAR U-CHERRY PT
 E CAR U-S JOHNSON CT
 E CARO U-CAMP LEJEUN
 E CAROLINA U ALL CMP
 E CAROLINA U MAIN CAMPUS
 E TENN ST U MAIN CAMPUS
 E TENN ST U-BRISTOL
 E TENN ST U-KINGSPRT
 EAST CENTRAL STATE COL
 EAST STROUDSBURG ST COL
 EAST TEXAS BAPTIST COL
 EASTERN BAPTIST COLLEGE
 EASTERN COLLEGE
 EASTERN CONN STATE COL
 EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIV
 EASTERN MENNONITE COLLE
 EASTERN MONTANA COLLEGE
 EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEG
 EASTERN NEW MEXICO UNIV
 EASTERN PILGRIM COLLEGE
 EASTERN WASHINGTON ST C
 EDGEWOOD COLLEGE
 EDINBORO STATE COLLEGE
 EDWARD WATERS COLLEGE
 EISENHOWER COLL
 ELIZABETHTOWN COLLEGE
 ELIZABETH CITY STATE CO
 ELON COLLEGE
 EMBRY-RIDDLE AERO INST
 EMERSON COLLEGE
 ERSKINE COLLEGE
 ESTRN KENTUCKY UNIVERSI
 EUREKA COLLEGE
 EVANGEL COLLEGE
 FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY
 FAIRLEIGH DICKINSON UNI
 FAIRLGH DCKSN-TEANCK
 FAIRLGH DCKSN-ED WMS
 FAIRMONT STATE COLLEGE
 FAITH BAPTIST BIBLE COL
 FARMINGTON STATE COLLEG
 FAYETTEVILLE STATE COL
 FEDERAL CITY COL
 FERRIS STATE COLLEGE

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

FINCH COLLEGE
 FINDLAY COLLEGE
 FLORENCE STATE COLLEGE
 FLORIDA INST OF TECH
 FLORIDA MEMORIAL COLLEGE
 FLORIDA SOUTHERN COLLEGE
 FLORIDA TECH UNIV
 FONTBONNE COLLEGE
 FORT HAYS KANS STATE CO
 FORT LEWIS COLLEGE
 FORT VALLEY STATE COLLEGE
 FORT WAYNE ART SCHOOL
 FORT WAYNE BIBLE COLLEGE
 FRANCIS T NICHOLLS ST C
 FRANCONIA COLLEGE
 FRANKLIN COL OF INDIANA
 FRANKLIN PIERCE COLLEGE
 FRANKLIN UNIVERSITY
 FREDERICK COLLEGE
 FREE WILL BAPT BIBLE CO
 FRIENDS BIBLE COL
 FRIENDS WORLD COLL
 FRLGH DCK-FLOR MADSN
 FROSTBURG STATE COLLEGE
 FT KENT STATE COLLEGE
 FT WRIGHT COL HOLY NAME
 GANNON COLLEGE
 GARRETT THEO SEM
 GEN BEADLE STATE COLLEGE
 GENERAL MOTORS INSTITUT
 GENEVA COLLEGE
 GEORGE FOX COLLEGE
 GEORGE WILLIAMS COLLEGE
 GEORGIA COLLEGE
 GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN CO
 GEORGIA SOUTHERN COLLEGE
 GEORGIAN COURT COLLEGE
 GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE
 GLENVILLE STATE COLLEGE
 GOLDEN GATE COLLEGE
 GOOD COUNSEL COLLEGE
 GORHAM STATE COLLEGE
 GRACE BIBLE COLLEGE
 GRACE BIBLE INSTITUTE
 GRACE THEOL SEM + COL
 GRACELAND COLLEGE
 GRAMBLING COLLEGE
 GRAND CANYON COLLEGE
 GRAND VALLEY STATE COL
 GRATZ COLL
 GREENSBORO COLLEGE

GREENVILLE COLLEGE
 GRND RPDS BAPT COL + SE
 GROVE CITY COLLEGE
 GUILFORD COLLEGE
 GULF COAST BIBLE COL
 HAMPTON INSTITUTE
 HARDIN SIMMONS UNIVERSI
 HARDING COL MAIN CAMPUS
 HARRIS TEACHERS COLLEGE
 HARTWICK COLLEGE
 HASTINGS COLLEGE
 HAWAII LOA COLL
 HEALD ENGR COLLEGE
 HEBREW TCHRS COLLEGE
 HEBREW UNION COL-ALL
 HENDERSON STATE COLLEGE
 HENDRIX COLLEGE
 HIGH POINT COLLEGE
 HIRAM SCOTT COLL
 HOLY APOSTLES SEMNRY
 HOLY FAMILY COLLEGE
 HOLY FAMILY COLLEGE
 HOUGHTON COLLEGE
 HOUSTON BAPTIST COLLEGE
 HRDNG COL SCH BBL TN
 HUNTINGDON COLLEGE
 HUNTINGTON COLLEGE
 HURON COLLEGE
 HUSSON COLLEGE
 HUSTON TILLOTSON COLLEGE
 IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY
 IMMAC CONCEPTION SEMINA
 IMMACULATA COLLEGE
 INCARNATE WORD COLLEGE
 IND U OF PA MAIN CAMPUS
 IND U PA PUNXSUTAWNEY
 IND U PA ARMSTRONG CO C
 IND UNIV HERRON SCH ART
 INDIANA CENTRAL COLLEGE
 INDIANA INSTITUTE OF TE
 INDIANA STATE UNIVERSIT
 INDIANA U OF PA-ALL
 INTER AMER U-P R-ALL
 IONA COLLEGE MAIN CAMPUS
 IONA COL ST GABRIEL COL
 IOWA WESLEYAN COLLEGE
 JACKSON STATE COLLEGE
 JACKSONVILLE STATE UNIV
 JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY
 JARVIS CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
 JERSEY CITY STATE COLLEGE

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

JEWISH THEOL SEM OF AME
 JOHN BROWN UNIVERSITY
 JOHN F KENNEDY COLL
 JOHN J PEPHING COLL
 JOHNSON C SMITH UNIV
 JOHNSON STATE COLLEGE
 JONES COLLEGE
 JONES COL ORLANDO CA
 JUDSON COLLEGE
 JUDSON COLLEGE
 JUILLIARD SCHOOL OF MUS
 KANS ST COL OF PITTSBUR
 KANS ST TCHRS COL EMPOR
 KANSAS CITY ART INSTITU
 KANSAS WESLEYAN UNIV
 KEARNEY STATE COLLEGE
 KENTUCKY CHRISTIAN COL
 KENTUCKY SOUTHERN COLLE
 KENTUCKY STATE COLLEGE
 KENTUCKY WESLEYAN COLLE
 KEUKA COLLEGE
 KINGS COLLEGE
 KINGS COLLEGE
 KIRKLAND COLLEGE
 KNOXVILLE COLLEGE
 KUTZTOWN STATE COLLEGE
 LA BAPT COL + THEOL SE
 LA GRANGE COLLEGE
 LA ROCHE COLLEGE
 LA VERNE COLLEGE
 LADYCLIFF COLLEGE
 LAKE ERIE COLLEGE
 LAKELAND COLLEGE
 LAMBUTH COLLEGE
 LANCASTER THEO SEM
 LANDER COLLEGE
 LANE COLLEGE
 LANGSTON UNIVERSITY
 LAWRENCE INST TECHNOLOG
 LAYTON SCHOOL OF ART
 LE MOYNE COLLEGE
 LEA COLLEGE
 LEE COLLEGE
 LENOIR-RHYNE COLLEGE
 LESLEY COLLEGE
 LETOURNEAU COLLEGE
 LEWIS COLLEGE
 LEWIS-CLARK NORMAL SCHO
 LIMESTONE COLLEGE
 LINCOLN CHRISTIAN COLLE
 LINCOLN MEMORIAL UNIV

LINCOLN UNIVERSITY
 LINCOLN UNIVERSITY
 LINDENWOOD COLLEGE
 LITTLE ROCK UNIVERSITY
 LIVINGSTON STATE COLLEG
 LIVINGSTONE COLLEGE
 LOCK HAVEN STATE COLLEG
 LOMA LINDA U LOMA LINDA C
 LOMA LINDA U LA SIERRA C
 LONGWOOD COLLEGE
 LORETTO HEIGHTS COLLEGE
 LOUISIANA COLLEGE
 LOWELL TECHNOLOGICAL IN
 LOYOLA COLLEGE
 LYCOMING COLLEGE
 LYNCHBURG COLLEGE
 LYNDON STATE COLLEGE
 MACKINAC COLLEGE
 MADISON BUSINESS COLLEG
 MADISON COLLEGE
 MADONNA COLLEGE
 MAINE MARITIME ACADEMY
 MALONE COLLEGE
 MANHATTAN BIBLE COLL
 MANHATTAN COLLEGE
 MANHATTAN SCHOOL OF MUS
 MANNES COLLEGE OF MUSIC
 MANSFIELD STATE COLLEGE
 MARIAN COL OF FOND DU L
 MARIAN COL INDIANAPOLIS
 MARILLAC COLLEGE
 MARION COLLEGE MARION
 MARIST COLLEGE
 MARK HOPKINS COLL
 MARS HILL COLLEGE
 MARSHALL UNIV MAIN CAMP
 MARSHALL UNIV LOGAN BR
 MARSHALL UNIV WILLIAMSO
 MARY COLLEGE
 MARY HARDIN BAYLOR COL
 MARY MANSE COLLEGE
 MARYCREST COLLEGE
 MARYKNOLL SEMINARY
 MARYKNOLL SEM
 MARYLAND INST COL OF AR
 MARYLHURST COL MAIN CAM
 MARYMOUNT COLLEGE
 MARYMOUNT COLLEGE
 MARYMOUNT COLLEGE
 MARYMOUNT MANHATTAN COL
 MARYVILLE COLLEGE

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

MARYVLE COL SACRED HEA
 MARYWOOD COLLEGE
 MASS COLL OF OPTOMET
 MASS COL OF PHARMACY
 MASS MARITIME ACADEMY
 MASSACHUSETTS COL OF AR
 MAYVILLE STATE COLLEGE
 MCKENDREE COLLEGE
 MCMURRY COLLEGE
 MCNEESE STATE COLLEGE
 MCPHERSON COLLEGE
 MEDAILLE COLLEGE
 MEDICAL COLLEGE OF S C
 MEDICAL COLL GEORGIA
 MEMPHIS ACADEMY OF ARTS
 MENLO COLLEGE
 MERCER UNIV-ALL CAMP
 MERCER UNIV MAIN CAMPUS
 MERCER U-STHN S PHRM
 MERCY COLLEGE OF DETROI
 MERCY COLLEGE
 MERCYHURST COLLEGE
 MEREDITH COLLEGE
 MESSIAH COLLEGE
 METHODIST COLLEGE
 METHODIST THEO SCH-O
 METROPOLITAN STATE COL
 MICHIGAN LUTHERAN COLLE
 MIDAMERICA NAZARENE
 MIDDLE TENNESSEE ST UNI
 MIDLAND LUTHERAN COLLEG
 MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITY
 MIDWESTERN COL
 MIDWSTRN BAPT THEO S
 MILES COLLEGE
 MILLERSVILLE STATE COL
 MILLIGAN COLLEGE
 MILLS COLLEGE OF EDUC
 MILTON COLLEGE
 MILTONVALE WESLEYAN COL
 MILWAUKEE SCHOOL OF ENG
 MINN BIBLE COLLEGE
 MINNEAPOLIS SCHOOL OF A
 MINOT STATE COLLEGE
 MISS STATE COL FOR WOME
 MISS VALLEY STATE COLLE
 MISSISSIPPI INDUS COLLE
 MISSOURI VALLEY COLLEGE
 MO SCH OF RELIGION
 MOBILE COLLEGE
 MOLLOY CATH COL MAIN CA

MOLLOY CATH ST ALBRT
 MOORE COLLEGE OF ART
 MOORHEAD STATE COLLEGE
 MOREHEAD STATE UNIVERSI
 MOREHOUSE COLLEGE
 MORGAN STATE COLLEGE
 MORRIS BROWN COLLEGE
 MORRIS COLLEGE
 MORRIS HARVEY COLLEGE
 MOUNT ANGEL COLLEGE
 MOUNT ANGEL SEMINARY
 MOUNT MARTY COLLEGE
 MOUNT MERCY COLLEGE
 MOUNT MERCY COLLEGE
 MOUNT SENARIO COLLEGE
 MOUNT ST PAUL COLLEGE
 MOUNT ST JOSEPH COLLEGE
 MOUNT ST MARYS COLLEGE
 MOUNT ST SCHOLASTICA CO
 MOUNT ST AGNES COLLEGE
 MOUNT ST MARYS COLLEGE
 MOUNT ST MARY COLLEGE
 MOUNT ST MARY COLLEGE
 MT MARY COL MAIN CAMPUS
 MULTNOMAH SCHOOL OF BIB
 MURRAY STATE UNIVERSITY
 MUSEUM ART SCHOOL
 N C COLLEGE AT DURHAM
 N C SCHOOL OF THE ARTS
 N C WESLEYAN COLLEGE
 N H COL ACCT + COMMERCE
 NASSON COLLEGE
 NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE COL
 NATIONAL COLLEGE OF EDU
 NATL COLLEGE OF BUSINES
 NAZARETH COL OF KENTUCK
 NAZARETH COLLEGE
 NEBRASKA WESLEYAN UNIV
 NER ISRAEL RABBINICAL C
 NEVADA SOUTHERN UNIV
 NEW ENG CONS OF MUSIC
 NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE
 NEW HAVEN COLLEGE
 NEW MEXICO HIGHLANDS UN
 NEW YORK COLLEGE OF MUS
 NEWARK STATE COLLEGE
 NEWBERRY COLLEGE
 NIAG U OUR LADY ANGL
 NIAGARA UNIV MAIN CAMPU
 NICHOLS COL OF BUS ADM
 NORTH CENTRAL BIBLE COL

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE	PAGE COL WESTCHESTER CA
NORTHEASTERN STATE COL	PACIF SCH RELIG
NORTHEAST BIBLE INST	PACIFIC CHRISTIAN CO
NORTHEASTERN ILL ST COL	PACIFIC COLLEGE
NORTHEAST MISSOURI S T	PACIFIC UNIVERSITY
NORTHERN STATE COLLEGE	PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE
NORTHERN MICHIGAN UNIV	PAINE COLLEGE
NORTHERN MONTANA COLLEG	PAN AMERICAN COLLEGE
NORTHLAND COLLEGE	PARK COLLEGE
NORTHROP INST OF TECH	PASADENA COLLEGE
NORTHWEST COLLEGE	PASDNA PLAYHS COL THR A
NORTHWESTERN STATE COL	PATERSON STATE COLLEGE
NORTHWEST CHRISTIAN COL	PAUL GUINN COLLEGE
NORTHWEST NAZARENE COL	PEABODY CONS OF MUSIC
NORTHWESTERN COLLEGE	PEMBROKE STATE COL
NORTHWEST MISSOURI ST C	PEPPERDINE COLLEGE
NOTRE DAME COLLEGE	PERU STATE COLLEGE
NOTRE DAME COLLEGE	PESTALOZZI FROEBELTC
NOTRE DAME COL STATEN I	PFEIFFER COLLEGE
NOTRE DAME COLLEGE	PHILA COLLEGE OF BIBLE
NTHWEST LOUISIANA ST COL	PHILA COL-OSTEOP MED
NTHWESTRN COLL BIBLE INS	PHILA COL PHARMACY + SC
NTHWSTRN ST COL LOUISIA	PHILA COLLEGE OF ART
NY INST TECH-ALL CAM	PHILA COL OF TEX + SCI
NY INST TECH MAIN CAMPU	PHILA MUSICAL ACADEMY
NY INST TECH OLD WESTBU	PHILANDER SMITH COLLEGE
NYACK MISSIONARY COLLEGE	PIEDMONT COLLEGE
OAKLAND CITY COLLEGE	PIEDMONT BIBLE COL INC
OAKWOOD COLLEGE	PIKEVILLE COLLEGE
OGLETHORPE COLLEGE	PORTLAND STATE UNIV
OHIO DOMINICAN COLL	PRAIRIE VIEW A + M COL
OK SCH B ACC FIN LAW	PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE
OKLA COL OF LIBERAL ART	PRESTCOTT COLL
OKLA PANHANDLE STATE CO	PROVIDENCE COLLEGE
OKLAHOMA BAPTIST UNIV	QUEENS COLLEGE
OKLAHOMA CHRISTIAN COL	QUINCY COLLEGE
OLD DOMINION COLLEGE	QUINNIPIAC COLLEGE
OLIVET COLLEGE	R I SCHOOL OF DESIGN
OLIVET NAZARENE COLLEGE	RADFORD COLLEGE
ORAL ROBERTS UNIV	REGIS COLLEGE
OREGON TECH INSTITUTE	REGIS COL WOMEN-MAIN CA
OTTAWA UNIVERSITY	REGIS COL WOMEN FRAMING
OUACHITA BAPTIST UNIV	RHODE ISLAND COLLEGE
OUR LADY OF THE LAKE CO	RICKER COLLEGE
OUR LADY OF CINCIN COL	RIO GRANDE COLLEGE
OUR LADY OF ANGELS COL	RIVIER COLLEGE
OUR LADY HOLY CROSS	ROANOKE COLLEGE
OWOSSO COLLEGE	ROBERTS WESLEYAN COLLEG
PAGE COLL ALL CAMP	ROCHESTER INST TECHNOLO
PAGE COLLEGE MAIN CAMPU	ROCKHURST COLLEGE

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

ROCKY MOUNTAIN COLLEGE
 ROSARY COLLEGE
 ROSARY HILL COLLEGE
 RUST COLLEGE
 S E BIBLE COLL
 S F CONS MUSIC
 SACRD HEART DOMINICAN C
 SACRED HEART UNIVERSITY
 SACRED HEART COLLEGE
 SACRED HEART SEMINARY
 SAGINAW VALLEY COLLEGE
 SALEM COLLEGE
 SALEM COL-CLARKSBURG
 SALEM COLLEGE
 SALISBURY STATE COLLEGE
 SALVE REGINA COLLEGE
 SAM HOUSTON STATE COL
 SAMFORD UNIVERSITY
 SAN FRISCO ART INST COL
 SAN JOSE BIBLE COLLEGE
 SAN LUIS REY COLLEGE
 SAVANNAH STATE COLLEGE
 SCH OF DAYTON ART IN
 SCH OF MUSEUM FINE ARTS
 SCHOOL OF THE OZARKS
 SCHOOLS OF THE ART INST
 SELMA UNIVERSITY
 SEM OF OUR LADY OF PROV
 SHAW UNIVERSITY
 SHELTON COLLEGE
 SHENANDOAH COL + CONS M
 SHEPHERD COLLEGE
 SHIPPENSBURG STATE COL
 SHORTER COLLEGE
 SHORTER COLLEGE
 SIENA COLLEGE
 SIENA COLL
 SIENA COLL
 SIENA COLL
 SIENA HEIGHTS COLLEGE
 SIMPSON BIBLE COLLEGE
 SIOUX FALLS COLLEGE
 SONOMA STATE COLLEGE
 SOUTH CAROLINA ST COLLE
 SOUTH TEXAS JR COLLEGE
 SOUTHEASTERN STATE COL
 SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
 SOUTHEASTERN BIBLE COL
 SOUTHEAST MISSOURI ST C
 SOUTHERN OREGON COLLEGE

SOUTHERN STATE COLLEGE
 SOUTHERN MISSIONARY COL
 SOUTHERN STATE COLLEGE
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COL
 SOUTHERN COLORADO ST CO
 SOUTHERN UNIV + A + M C
 SOUTHWESTN ASSEMB GOD C
 SOUTHWEST TEXAS STATE C
 SOUTHWESTERN STATE COL
 SOUTHWESTERN COLL
 SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE
 SOUTHWEST MINN STATE CO
 SOUTHWEST MISSOURI ST C
 SPELMAN COLLEGE
 SPRING ARBOR COLLEGE
 SPRING HILL COLLEGE
 ST AMBROSE COLLEGE
 ST ANDREWS PRESBY COL
 ST ANSELMS COLLEGE
 ST AUGUSTINES COL
 ST BENEDICT COLLEGE
 ST BENEDICTS COLLEGE
 ST BERNARD COLLEGE
 ST BONAVENTURE UNIVERSI
 ST CHARLES BORROMEO SEM
 ST CLOUD STATE COLLEGE
 ST DOMINIC COLLEGE
 ST EDWARDS UNIVERSITY
 ST FRANCIS COLLEGE
 ST FRANCIS COLLEGE
 ST FRANCIS COLLEGE
 ST GREGORYS COLLEGE
 ST JOHN COL OF CLEVELAN
 ST JOHN FISHER COL INC
 ST JOHNS COLLEGE
 ST JOS COLL CAPU SEM
 ST JOS SEM COL MAIN CAM
 ST JOSEPH COLLEGE
 ST JOSEPH COLLEGE
 ST JOSEPH COL MAIN CAMP
 ST JOSEPH COL E CHICAGO
 ST JOSEPHS COLLEGE
 ST JOSEPH COLLEGE
 ST JOSEPHS COL FOR WOMEN
 ST LEO COLLEGE
 ST LOUIS COL OF PHARMAC
 ST LOUIS INST MUSIC
 ST MARTINS COLLEGE
 ST MARY COLLEGE
 ST MARY OF THE WOODS CO

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

ST MARY OF THE PLAINS C
 ST MARYS UNIVERSITY
 ST MARYS COLLEGE
 ST MARYS DOMINICAN COL
 ST MARYS SEM + U MAIN C
 ST MARYS ST CHARLES COL
 ST MARYS COLLEGE
 ST MARYS COLLEGE
 ST MEINRAD SEMINARY
 ST MICHAELS COLLEGE
 ST NORBERT COLLEGE
 ST PATRICKS COL
 ST PAUL BIBLE COLLEGE
 ST PAULS COLLEGE
 ST PAULS SCH THEOLOG
 ST PETERS COLLEGE
 ST PROCOPIUS COLLEGE
 ST THOMAS SEMINARY
 ST THOMAS AQUINAS COLLE
 ST VINCENT COLLEGE
 STANISLAUS STATE COLLEG
 STATE COLLEGE OF ARK
 STATE COL AT BRIDGEWATE
 STATE COL AT FITCHBURG
 STATE COL AT FRAMINGHAM
 STATE COL AT LOWELL
 STATE COL AT NORTH ADAM
 STATE COL AT SALEM
 STATE COL AT WESTFIELD
 STATE COL AT WORCESTER
 STATE COL AT BOSTON
 STEPHENS COLLEGE
 STERLING COLLEGE
 STEASTRN MASS TECH INS
 STEASTRN LOUISIANA COL
 STILLMAN COLLEGE
 STOUT ST UNIV MAIN CAMP
 STOUT ST U BARRON CO BR
 SUFFOLK UNIV MAIN CAMPU
 SUFFOLK UNIV LAW SCH
 SUL ROSS STATE COLLEGE
 SUNY COLLEGE BROCKPORT
 SUNY COLLEGE BUFFALO
 SUNY COLLEGE CORTLAND
 SUNY COLLEGE GENESEO
 SUNY COLLEGE PLATTSBURG
 SUNY COLLEGE POTSDAM
 SUNY MARITIME COLLEGE
 SUNY OLD WESTBURY
 SUNY RANGER SCH FOR

SWAIN SCH OF DESIGN
 TABOR COLLEGE
 TAHOE PARADISE COL
 TALLADEGA COLLEGE
 TARKIO COLLEGE
 TARLETON STATE COLLEGE
 TAYLOR UNIVERSITY
 TEMPLE BUELL COLLEGE
 TENN AG + INDUS ST UNIV
 TENN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIV
 TENN WESLEYAN COLLEGE
 TENNESSEE TEMPLE COLLEG
 TEXAS A + I UNIVERSITY
 TEXAS COLLEGE
 TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIV
 TEXAS WESLEYAN COLLEGE
 THIEL COLLEGE
 THOMAS COLLEGE
 TIFFIN UNIVERSITY
 TIFT COLLEGE
 TOCCOA FALLS INSTITUTE
 TOUGALOO COLLEGE
 TOWSON STATE COLLEGE
 TRENTON STATE COLL
 TREVECCA NAZARENE COLLE
 TRI-STATE COLLEGE
 TRINITY COLLEGE
 TRINITY COLLEGE
 TROY STATE U MAIN CAMPUS
 TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE
 U S DIEGO SCHL LAW
 U SAN DIEGO COL FOR WOM
 U SAN DIEGO COL FOR MEN
 UNION COLLEGE
 UNION COLLEGE
 UNION UNIVERSITY
 UNIV DUBUQUE MAIN CAMPU
 UNIV DUBUQUE THEO SM
 UNIV N H PLYMOUTH ST CO
 UNIV NEBRASKA OMAHA
 UNIV OF ALBUQUERQUE
 UNIV OF CORPUS CHRISTI
 UNIV OF EVANSVILLE
 UNIV OF MARYLAND ST COL
 UNIV OF NORTHERN IOWA
 UNIV OF N H KEENE ST CO
 UNIV OF N C AT CHARLOTT
 UNIV OF SOUTH ALABAMA
 UNIV OF SOUTH FLORIDA
 UNIV OF TEX AT ARLINGTO

QUALITY VI INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

UNIV OF VA MARY WASH CO
 UNIV OF WEST FLORIDA
 UNIVERSITY OF ST THOMAS
 UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
 UNIVERSITY OF SCRANTON
 UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA
 UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE
 UPPER IOWA UNIVERSITY
 URSULINE COL FOR WOMEN
 URSULINE COL
 US INTERNATIONAL UNIV
 VA CMNWLTU MAIN C
 VA CMNWLTU MED COL V
 VA STATE COL MAIN CAMPUS
 VA STATE COL NORFOLK DI
 VALDOSTA STATE COLLEGE
 VALLEY CITY STATE COLLEGE
 VANDERCOOK COLL MUS
 VENNARD COLLEGE
 VERMONT COLLEGE
 VILLA MARIA COLLEGE
 VILLA MADONNA COLLEGE
 VIRGA SEM AND COLL
 VIRGA WESLEYAN COLL
 VIRGINIA UNION UNIVERSI
 VITERBO COLLEGE
 W LIB ST COL HNCOCK CO
 W LIBERTY ST COL MAIN C
 W VIRGINIA INST OF TECH
 W VIRGINIA WESLEYAN COL
 WAGNER COLLEGE
 WALLA WALLA COLLEGE
 WALSH COLLEGE
 WARNER PACIFIC COLLEGE
 WARTBURG COLLEGE
 WASHBURN UNIV OF TOPEKA
 WASHINGTON BIBLE COLLEGE
 WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE
 WAYLAND BAPTIST COLLEGE
 WAYNE STATE COLLEGE
 WAYNESBURG COLLEGE
 WEBSTER COLLEGE
 WESLEYAN COLLEGE
 WEST CHESTER STATE COL
 WEST COAST U MAIN
 WEST CST U ORGE CTY
 WEST GEORGIA COLLEGE
 WEST TEXAS STATE UNIV
 WEST VIRGINIA STATE COL

WESTBROOK JUNIOR COLLEGE
 WESTERN COLLEGE FOR WOMEN
 WESTERN CONN ST COLLEGE
 WESTERN CAROLINA UNIV
 WESTERN MONTANA COLLEGE
 WESTERN NEW ENGLAND COL
 WESTERN NEW MEXICO UNIV
 WESTMAR COLLEGE
 WESTMINSTER COLLEGE
 WESTMINSTER COLLEGE
 WESTMINSTER CHOIR COLLEGE
 WHEELING COLLEGE
 WHELOCK COLLEGE
 WHITTIER COLLEGE
 WHITWORTH COLLEGE
 WHITWORTH COLL
 WILBERFORCE UNIVERSITY
 WILEY COLLEGE
 WILLIAM CAREY COLLEGE
 WILLIAM J BRYAN COLLEGE
 WILLIAM JEWELL COLLEGE
 WILLIAM PENN COLLEGE
 WILLIAM WOODS COLLEGE
 WILMINGTON COLLEGE
 WILMINGTON COLLEGE
 WINDHAM COLLEGE
 WINONA STATE COLLEGE
 WINSTON-SALEM STATE COL
 WINTHROP COLLEGE
 WIS STATE UNIV EAU CLAI
 WIS STATE UNIV RIVER FL
 WIS STATE UNIV WHITEWAT
 WOODBURY COLLEGE
 WRIGHT STATE UNIV
 WSTRN BAPT COL + THEO S
 WSTRN KENTUCKY UNIVERSI
 WSTRN STATE COL COLORAD
 XAVIER UNIVERSITY
 YAMPA VALLEY COLLEGE
 YANKTON COLLEGE
 YOUNGSTOWN ST UNIVERSIT

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS

ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRIC C
 ACADEMY OF AERONAUTICS
 ADIRONDACK COMMUNITY CO
 AIMS COLLEGE
 ALABAMA CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
 ALBANY JR COLLEGE
 ALEXANDR CTY STATE JR C
 ALICE LLOYD COLLEGE
 ALLAN HANCOCK COLLEGE
 ALLEGANY COMMUNITY COL
 ALLEN ACADEMY
 ALLEN CO CMTY JUNIOR CO
 ALPENA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
 ALPHONSUS COLL
 ALTUS JR COLLEGE
 ALVIN JR COLLEGE
 AMARILLO COLLEGE
 AMER RIVR COL MAIN CAMP
 AMER RVR COL PLACERVIL C
 AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ART
 ANCILLA DOMINI COLL
 ANDERSON COLLEGE
 ANDREW COLLEGE
 ANGELINA CO JR COLL
 ANNE ARUNDEL CMTY COLLEGE
 ANOKA-RAMSEY ST JR COL
 ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
 APPALACHIAN BIB INST
 AQUINAS JC OF BUS
 AQUINAS JR COLL
 AQUINAS SCHOOL
 ARAPAHOE JR COLLEGE
 AREA TEN CMTY COLLEGE
 ARIZONA WESTERN COLLEGE
 ASHEVL BUNCOMBE TECH IN
 ASHLAND COUNTY TCHRS CO
 ASSUMPTION COLLEGE
 ATLANTIC CMTY COLLEGE
 AUBURN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
 AUBURN MAINE SCH OF COM
 AUSTIN STATE JR COLLEGE
 AVERETT COLLEGE
 BACONE COLLEGE
 BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE
 BALTIMORE JR COLLEGE
 BARSTOW COLLEGE
 BAY DE NOC COMMUNITY CO
 BAY PATH JUNIOR COLLEGE
 BECKER JR COLLEGE
 BECKLEY COLLEGE

BEE COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE
 BELLEVILLE JR COLLEGE
 BELLEVUE CMTY COLLEGE
 BENNETT COLLEGE
 BERGEN CMTY COLL
 BERK-CHAR-DOR TCH ED
 BERKSHIRE CMTY COLLEGE
 BIG BEND COMMUNITY COL
 BISMARCK JR COLLEGE
 BLACK HAWK COLLEGE
 BLACK HAWK COL/KEWAN
 BLINN COLLEGE
 BLISS COLLEGE
 BLUE MOUNTAIN CMTY COL
 BLUE RIDGE CMTY COLLEGE
 BLUEFIELD COLLEGE
 BOONE JR COLLEGE
 BRADFORD JR COLLEGE
 BRAINERD STATE JR COLLEGE
 BRANDYWINE JR COLL
 BRAZOSPORT JR COLL
 BREVARD COLLEGE
 BREVARD JR COLLEGE
 BREWTON PARKER COLLEGE
 BRISTOL CMTY COLLEGE
 BROOKDALE CMTY COLL
 BROOME TECH COMMUNITY C
 BRUNSWICK JUNIOR COLLEGE
 BRYANT + STRATTON COM S
 BUCKS COUNTY CMTY COLLEGE
 BUFFALO DIOCESAN PREP S
 BURDETT COLLEGE
 BUTLER CO CMTY COLLEGE
 BUTLER COUNTY CMTY JR C
 BUTTE JR COLLEGE
 CABRILLO COLLEGE
 CALDWELL TECH INST
 CALIFORNIA CONCORDIA CO
 CAMBRIDGE SCH OF BUSINE
 CAMDEN COUNTY COLL
 CAMERON STATE AGRIC COL
 CANADA COLLEGE
 CANAL ZONE COLLEGE
 CANTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE
 CAPE COD COMMUNITY COL
 CARL SANDBURG COLL
 CASPER COLLEGE
 CATAWBA VALLEY TECH INS
 CATONSVILLE CMTY COLLEGE
 CAZENOVIA COLLEGE
 CECIL CO CMUNTY COLL

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

CENTERVILLE COMMUNITY C
 CENTRAL COLLEGE
 CENTRAL FLORIDA JR COL
 CENTRAL NEBR TECH
 CENTRAL OREGON CMTY COL
 CENTRAL PIEDMONT CMTY C
 CENTRAL TECH INSTITUTE
 CENTRAL TEXAS COLLEGE
 CENTRAL VA CMTY COLLEGE
 CENTRAL YMCA CMTY COLLE
 CENTRALIA COLLEGE
 CERRITOS COLLEGE
 CHABOT COLLEGE
 CHAFFEY COLLEGE
 CHAMBERLAYNE JR COLL
 CHAMPLAIN COLLEGE
 CHARLES CO COMMUNITY CO
 CHATTANOOGA CITY COLLEG
 CHATTANOOGA ST TECH INS
 CHESAPEAKE COLLEGE
 CHGO CITY COL BOGAN CAM
 CHGO CITY COL LOOP CAM
 CHGO CTY COL CRANE CAM
 CHGO CTY COL FENGER CAM
 CHGO CTY COL STHEAST CA
 CHGO CTY COL WILSON CAM
 CHGO CTY COL WRIGHT CAM
 CHGO CY COL AMNDSN-MYFA
 CHICAGO ACAD OF FINE AR
 CHIPOLA JR COLLEGE
 CHOWAN COLLEGE
 CHRISTIAN COL OF STHWES
 CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
 CHRSTOPHR COL CORP CHRS
 CISCO JR COLLEGE
 CITRUS JR COL
 CITY COL OF SAN FRANCIS
 CLACKAMUS CMTY COLLEGE
 CLARENDON COLLEGE
 CLARK CO TECH INST
 CLARK COLLEGE
 CLARKE MEMORIAL COLLEGE
 CLATSOP CMTY COLLEGE
 CLEVELAND STATE CMTY CO
 CLOUD COUNTY CMTY JR CO
 CMTY C ALLEG CO ALLEG C
 CMTY C ALLEG CO EAST CA
 CMTY C ALLEG CO SOUTH C
 CMTY COL OF PHILA
 CMTY COL OF BEAVER CO
 CMTY COL OF DELAWARE CO

CMTY COLL OF DENVER
 CMTY COLL-FINGER LKS
 COAHOMA JR COLLEGE
 COALINGA COLLEGE
 COCHISE COLLEGE
 COFFEYVILLE COLLEGE
 COGSWELL POLY COLL
 COL VIRGIN IS MAIN CAMP
 COL VRGN IS-ST CROIX
 COLBY CMTY JR COLLEGE
 COLL OF DUPAGE
 COLL OF EASTERN UTAH
 COLL OF ST GERTRUDE
 COLLEGE OF ALAMEDA
 COLLEGE OF MARIN
 COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO
 COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN IDA
 COLLEGE OF THE MAINLAND
 COLLEGE OF THE DESERT
 COLLEGE OF THE REDWOODS
 COLLEGE OF THE SEQUOIAS
 COLLEGE OF THE SISKIYOU
 COLLEGE OF THE ALBEMARL
 COLORADO MTN COLLEGE
 COLUMBIA CHRISTIAN COL
 COLUMBIA BASIN CMTY COL
 COLUMBIA JR COLL
 COLUMBIA STATE CMTY COL
 COLUMBUS COLLEGE
 COMPTON COLLEGE
 CONCORDIA COLLEGE
 CONCORDIA COLLEGE
 CONCORDIA COLLEGIATE IN
 CONCORDIA LUTHERAN COL
 CONCORDIA LUTHERAN JR C
 CONNORS STATE AGRIC COL
 CONTRA COSTA COLLEGE
 COOKE COUNTY JR COLLEGE
 COPIAH LINCOLN JR COL
 CORBETT JR COLL
 CORNING COMMUNITY COLLE
 COTTEY COLLEGE
 COUNTY COL OF MORRIS
 COWLEY COUNTY CMTY JR C
 CROSIER SEMINARY
 CROWDER COLLEGE
 CUESTA COLLEGE
 CUMBERLAND COUNTY COLLE
 CUMBERLAND COL OF TENN
 CUNY QUEENSBORO CMTY CO
 CUNY BRONX COMMUNITY CO

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

CUNY KINGSBORO CMTY COL
 CUNY MANHATTAN CMTY COL
 CUNY N Y CITY CMTY COL
 CUNY STATEN IS CMTY COL
 CUYAHOGA CMTY C-ALL
 CUYHOG CMTY COL METRO C
 CUYHOG CMTY COL WSTRN C
 CYPRESS COLLEGE
 DABNEY LANCASTER CMTY C
 DALLAS BAPTIST COLLEGE
 DALTON JR COL
 DANVILLE CMTY COLLEGE
 DANVILLE JR COLLEGE
 DAVENPORT COL OF BUSINE
 DAVIDSON CO CMTY COL
 DAVIS JR COL OF BUS
 DAWSON COLLEGE
 DAYTONA BEACH JR COLLEG
 DE ANZA JR COLLEGE
 DE LIMA JR COLLEGE
 DE SALES PREP SEM INC
 DEAN JR COLLEGE
 DEKALB COLLEGE
 DEL MAR COLLEGE
 DELAWARE TECH/CMTY C
 DELGADO COL
 DELTA COLLEGE
 DEVRY TECH INSTITUTE
 DIABLO VALLEY COLLEGE
 DIXIE COLLEGE
 DODGE CITY CMTY JR COL
 DODGE COUNTY TEACHERS C
 DONNELLY COLLEGE
 DOOR KEWAUNEE CO T C
 DURHAM TECH INST
 DUTCHESS CMTY COLLEGE
 EAST CENTRAL JR COLLEGE
 EAST LOS ANGELES COLLEG
 EAST MISSISSIPPI JR COL
 EASTERN ARIZONA COLLEGE
 EASTERN WYOMING COLLEGE
 EDISON JUNIOR COLLEGE
 EDMONDS CMTY COLLEGE
 EL CAMINO COLLEGE
 EL CENTRO COLLEGE
 EL RENO JR COLLEGE
 ELGIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE
 ELIZABETH SETON COLLEGE
 ELLEN CUSHING JR COLLEG
 ELLSWORTH COLLEGE
 EMMANUEL COLLEGE

EMMETSBURG CMTY COLLEGE
 ENDICOTT JR COLLEGE
 ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS COLLEG
 ENTERPRISE ST JR COL
 ERIE CO TECH INSTITUTE
 ESSEX COMMUNITY COLLEGE
 ESSEX COUNTY COLL
 ESTHERVILLE JR COLLEGE
 ESTRN IA CMTY COL CLINT
 ESTRN IA CMTY C SCOTT C
 ESTRN IA CMTY COL MUSCAT
 ESTRN OKLAHOMA STATE CO
 EVERETT CMTY COLLEGE
 FAIRBURY JR COLLEGE
 FASHION INSTITUTE OF TE
 FAYETTEVILLE TECH IN
 FELICIAN COLLEGE
 FERGUS FALLS STATE JR C
 FERRUM JR COLLEGE
 FISHER JUNIOR COLLEGE
 FLATHEAD VLY CMTY COL
 FLINT CMTY JR COLLEGE
 FLORENCE DARL TCH ED
 FLORIDA COLLEGE
 FLORIDA JR COL JACKSONV
 FLORIDA KEYS JUNIOR COL
 FLORISSANT VLY COLL
 FOOTHILL COLLEGE
 FORSYTH TECH INST
 FORSYTH SCH DENT HYGNT
 FORT SCOTT CMTY JR COL
 FRANK PHILLIPS COLLEGE
 FRANKLIN INST OF BOSTON
 FREDERICK CMTY COLLEGE
 FREED HARDEMAN COLLEGE
 FREEMAN JR COLLEGE
 FREMONT CO CMTY COLL
 FRESNO CITY COLLEGE
 FRIENDSHIP JUNIOR COLLE
 FT STEILACOOM CMTY C
 FT WORTH CHRISTIAN COL
 FULLERTON JR COLLEGE
 FULTON-MONTGOMRY CMTY C
 GADSDEN STATE JR COLLEG
 GAINESVILLE JR COLL
 GALVESTON CMTY COLLEGE
 GARDEN CITY CMTY JR COL
 GARDNER WEBB COLLEGE
 GARLAND JR COLLEGE
 GASTON COLLEGE
 GAVILAN COLLEGE

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

GENESEE CMTY COLLEGE	HORRY-MAR-GEO TCH ED
GEO C WALLACE ST TECH S	HOWARD COUNTY JR COL
GEORGIA MILITARY COLLEGE	HUDSON VALLEY CMTY COL
GLEN OAKS CMTY COLLEGE	HUMPHREYS COLLEGE
GLENDALE COMMUNITY COL	HUTCHINSON CMTY JR COL
GLENDALE COLLEGE	IA CEN CMTY COL FT DODG
GLOUCESTER CO COLL	IA CEN CMY COL EAGLE GR.
GOGEBIC COMMUNITY COLLE	IA CEN CMY COL WEBSTER
GOLDEN VLY LUTH COLLEGE	IA WSTRN CMY COL CLARIN
GOLDEN WEST COLLEGE	IA WSTRN CMY COL CNCL B
GOLDEY BEACON JR COL	ILLINOIS CENTRAL COLLEGE
GORDON MILITARY COLLEGE	ILLINOIS VALLEY CMTY CO
GRAND RAPIDS JR COLLEGE	IMMACULATA COLLEGE
GRAND VIEW COLLEGE	IMMACULATA COL OF WASH
GRAYS HARBOR COLLEGE	IMMACULATA COLLEGE
GRAYSON CO JR COLLEGE	IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE
GREEN MOUNTAIN COLLEGE	INDEPENDENCE CMTY JR CO
GREEN RIVER CMTY COLLEGE	INDIAN RIVER JR COLLEGE
GREENBRIER COLLEGE	ISOTHERMAL CMTY COLLEGE
GREENFIELD CMTY COLLEGE	ITASCA STATE JR COLLEGE
GREENVL TECHNICAL ED CT	ITAWAMBA J C-ALL CAM
GROSSMONT COLLEGE	ITAWAMBA JC VOC TEC
GTR HARTFORD CMTY CO	ITAWAMBA JR COLLEGE
GUILFORD TECH	J CONNALLY TECH INST
GULF COAST JR COLL	JACKSN CO JC PERKNSTN C
GULF PARK JR COLLEGE	JACKSON CMTY COLLEGE
HAGERSTOWN JR COLLEGE	JACKSON STATE CMTY C
HANNIBAL LA GRANGE COL	JACKSONVILLE COLL
HARCUM JR COLLEGE	JAMES SPRUNT INST
HARFORD JR COLLEGE	JAMESTOWN COMMUNITY COL
HARRISBURG AREA CMTY CO	JC OF ST LOUIS CO
HARTFORD COL FOR WOMEN	JEFF DAVIS COL PERKINST
HARTFORD ST TECH COLLEGE	JEFFERSON COLLEGE
HARTNELL COLLEGE	JEFFERSON COMMUNITY COL
HENDERSON COUNTY JR COL	JEFFERSON DAVIS ST JR C
HENRY FORD COMMUNITY CO	JEFFERSON STATE JR COL
HERKIMER CO CMTY COL	JOHN A LOGAN COLL
HESSTON COLLEGE	JOHN C CALHOUN ST TECH
HIBBING STATE JR COLLEGE	JOHN TYLER CMTY COLLEGE
HIGHLAND CMTY JR COLLEGE	JOHNSN + WALES JR COL B
HIGHLAND COMMUNITY COL	JOLIET JR COLLEGE
HIGHLAND PARK COLLEGE	JONES COUNTY JR COLLEGE
HIGHLINE COLLEGE	JR COLLEGE BROWARD COUN
HILL JUNIOR COLLEGE	JUDSON BAPTIST COLLEGE
HILLSBOROUGH JR COLL	KALAMAZOO VLY CMTY C
HINDS JR COLLEGE	KANKAKEE CMTY COLL
HIWASSEE COLLEGE	KANS CTY KANS CMTY JR C
HOLMES JR COLLEGE	KASKASKIA COLLEGE
HOLY CROSS JR COLL	KELLOGG COMMUNITY COLLE
HOLYOKE COMMUNITY COLLE	KEMPER MILITARY SCH + C

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

ENDALL COLLEGE
 KENNESAW JR COLL
 KENOSHA TECH INST
 KETTERING COL MD ART
 KEYSTONE JR COLLEGE
 KILGORE COLLEGE
 KINGS COLLEGE
 KIRKLAND CMTY COLL
 KIRKLAND HALL COLLEGE
 KISHWAUKEE COLLEGE
 KITTRELL COLLEGE
 LA SALETTE SEM
 LABETTE CMTY JR COLLEGE
 LACKAWANNA JR COLLEGE
 LAKE-SUMTER JR COLLEGE
 LAKE MICHIGAN COLLEGE
 LAKE REGION JR COLLEGE
 LAKELAND CMTY COLLEGE
 LAKELAND COLLEGE
 LAKEWOOD ST JR COLLEGE
 LAMAR JR COLLEGE
 LANCASTER SCH OF BIBLE
 LANE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
 LANEY COLLEGE
 LANGLADE COUNTY TCHRS C
 LANSING COMMUNITY COLLEGE
 LAREDO JR COLLEGE
 LASELL JR COLLEGE
 LASSEN COLLEGE
 LATTER-DAY SAINTS BUS C
 LEE COLLEGE
 LEES MCRAE COLLEGE
 LEES JR COLLEGE
 LEHIGH CO CMTY COLLEGE
 LEICESTER JUNIOR COLLEGE
 LENOR CO CMTY COL MAIN C
 LINCOLN COLLEGE
 LINCOLN LAND JR COLL
 LINDSEY WILSON COLLEGE
 LINN-BENTON CMTY COLLEGE
 LK CTY JC + FOR RNGER S
 LON MORRIS COLLEGE
 LONG BEACH CITY COLLEGE
 LORAIN CO CMTY COLLEGE
 LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE
 LOS ANGELES HARBOR COL
 LOS ANGELES PIERCE COL
 LOS ANGELES STHWST COL
 LOS ANGELES TR TECH COL
 LOS ANGELES VALLEY COL
 LOUISBURG COLLEGE

LOURDES JR COLL
 LOWER COLUMBIA COLLEGE
 LUBBOCK CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
 LUTHER COLLEGE
 LUZERNE CO CMTY COLLEGE
 MACCORMAC COLLEGE
 MACOMB CO C C-CTR CA
 MACOMB COUNTY CMTY COL
 MACON JR COLLEGE
 MADISON VOC-TECH + AD S
 MAGIC VLY CHRISTIAN COL
 MANATEE JR COLLEGE
 MANCHESTER COMMUNITY CO
 MANITOWOC CO TCHRS COL
 MANOR JR COLLEGE
 MARIA REGINA COLLEGE
 MARIA COLLEGE OF ALBANY
 MARICOPA TECH COLL
 MARION INSTITUTE
 MARJORIE WEBSTER JR COL
 MARSHALLTOWN CMTY COLLEGE
 MARTIN COLLEGE
 MARY HOLMES JR COLLEGE
 MARYMOUNT COLLEGE OF VA
 MARYMOUNT COLLEGE
 MASS BAY COMMUNITY COL
 MASSASOIT CMTY COLLEGE
 MATER CHRISTI SEMINARY
 MATER DEI COLLEGE
 MATTATUCK CMTY COL
 MAUNAOLO COLLEGE OF HAW
 MCCOOK COLLEGE
 MCHENRY CO JR COLL
 MCLENNAN CMTY COLLEGE
 MERCED COLLEGE
 MERCER CO CMTY COL
 MERIDIAN JUNIOR COLLEGE
 MERRITT COLLEGE
 MESA COLLEGE MAIN CAMPU
 MESA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
 MESABI STATE JR COLLEGE
 METRO STATE JR COLLEGE
 METROPOLITAN JR COLLEGE
 MIAMI-DADE JUNIOR COLLEGE
 MIAMI-JACOBS JR COL BUS
 MICHIGAN CHRISTIAN JR C
 MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE
 MIDDLESEX CMTY COL
 MIDDLESEX COUNTY COLLEGE
 MIDWAY JR COLLEGE
 MILES CMTY COLLEGE

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

MILWAUKEE INST TECHNOLO
 MINERAL AREA COLLEGE
 MIRA COSTA COL
 MISSIONARY AVN INST
 MISSISSIPPI DELTA JR CO
 MISSOURI SOUTHERN COLLE
 MISSOURI WESTERN COL
 MITCHELL COLLEGE
 MITCHELL COLLEGE
 MOBERLY JR COLLEGE
 MOBILE STATE JR COLLEGE
 MODESTO JR COLLEGE
 MOHAWK VALLEY CMTY COL
 MONROE COMMUNITY COLLEG
 MONROE COUNTY CMTY COL
 MONTCALM CMTY COLLEGE
 MONTEREY PENINSULA COL
 MONTGOMERY CO CMTY COL
 MONTGOMERY JC ROCKVILLE
 MONTGOMERY JC TAKOMA PA
 MONTICELLO COLLEGE
 MONTREAT-ANDERSON COL I
 MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE
 MOORPARK JR COLLEGE
 MORaine VLY CMTY COL
 MORRISTOWN COLLEGE
 MORSE COLLEGE INC
 MORTON JR COLLEGE
 MOUNT ALOYSIUS JR COLLE
 MOUNT IDA JR COLLEGE
 MOUNT OLIVE JR COL
 MOUNT SAN ANTONIO COLLE
 MOUNT ST CLARE COLLEGE
 MOUNT VERNON JR COLLEGE
 MOUNT WACHUSETT CMTY CO
 MT HOOD CMTY COLLEGE
 MT SACRED HEART COL
 MT SAN JACINTO COLLEGE
 MT VERNON COMTY COLL
 MT VERNON NAZARN COL
 MULTNOMAH COLLEGE
 MURRAY ST COL AG+APSCI
 MUSKEGON BUSINESS COLLE
 MUSKEGON CO CMTY COLLEG
 N DAK STATE SCHOOL SCI
 N DAK SCHOOL OF FORESTR
 N H TECH INST CONCORD
 N H VOC INST MANCHESTER
 N H VOC INST PORTSMOUTH
 N IOWA AREA CMTY COLLEG

NAPA COLLEGE
 NASSAU CMTY COLLEGE
 NATCHEZ JR COLLEGE
 NATIONAL BUSINESS COLLE
 NAVARRO JR COLLEGE
 NEOSHO COUNTY CMTY JR C
 NEW ENGLAND AERO INS
 NEW MEXICO JUNIOR COLLE
 NEW MEXICO MILITARY INS
 NEW RIVER VOC TECH SCHO
 NEWTON JR COLLEGE
 NIAGARA COUNTY CMTY COL
 NO CENTRAL MICHIGAN COL
 NORFOLK JR COLLEGE
 NORMAN COLLEGE
 NORMANDELE ST JR COL
 NORTH COUNTRY CMTY C
 NORTH CTRAL TCH INST
 NORTH FLORIDA JR COLLEG
 NORTH GREENVILLE JR COL
 NORTH HENNEPIN ST JR CO
 NORTH IDAHO JR COLLEGE
 NORTH PLATTE COLLEGE
 NORTH SHORE CMTY COLLEG
 NORTHAMPTN COMMERCIAL C
 NORTHEAST ALA ST JR COL
 NORTHEASTERN JR COLLEGE
 NORTHEASTN OKLA A + M C
 NORTHERN ESSEX CMTY COL
 NORTHERN OKLAHOMA COLLE
 NORTHERN VA CMTY COLLEG
 NORTHLAND STATE JR COL
 NORTHWEST ALA ST JR COL
 NORTHWEST COMMUNITY COL
 NORTHWESTERN MICHIGAN C
 NORTHWOOD INST ALMA
 NORTHWESTRN CONN CMTY CO
 NORWALK COMMUNITY COL
 NORWALK STATE TECH COL
 NTHAMPTN CO AREA CMTY C
 NTHEST MISSISSIPPI JR C
 NTHESTRN CHRISTN JR COL
 NTHWD INST CEDAR HILL T
 NTHWD INST W BADEN IND
 NTHWOOD INST MAIN CAMPU
 NTHWST MISSISSIPPI JR C
 OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLE
 OAKLD C C-ORCHRD RDG
 OAKLND C C-AUBURN HL
 OAKLND C C-HIGHLND LK

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

OCEAN COUNTY COLLEGE
 ODESSA COLLEGE
 OHIO COL OF APP SCIENCE
 OHIO TECHNICAL COLLEGE
 OHIO VALLEY COLLEGE
 OHLONE COL
 OKALOOSA WALTON JR COL
 OKLAHOMA MILITARY ACAD
 OLNEY CENTRAL COLL
 OLYMPIC COLLEGE
 ONONDAGA CMTY COLLEGE
 ORANGBG CALHN TCH ED
 ORANGE COAST COLLEGE
 ORANGE COUNTY CMTY COL
 ORLANDO JUNIOR COLLEGE
 OTERO JR COLLEGE
 OTTUMWA HEIGHTS COLLEGE
 OUR LADY OF ANGELS JR C
 OUTAGAMIE CO TCHRS COL
 PACKER COLLEGIATE INST
 PADUCAH JR COLLEGE
 PALM BEACH JR COLLEGE
 PALMER COL MAIN CAMPUS
 PALMER COLLEGE COLUMBIA
 PALMER JR COL
 PALO VERDE COLLEGE
 PALOMAR COLLEGE
 PAMLICO INDUS ED CTR
 PANOLA COLLEGE
 PARIS JR COLLEGE
 PARKLAND JR COLLEGE
 PARSONS SCHOOL OF DESIG
 PASADENA CITY COLLEGE
 PATRICK HENRY ST JR COL
 PAUL SMITHS COL ARTS SC
 PEACE COLLEGE
 PEARL RIVER JR COLLEGE
 PEIRCE JUNIOR COLLEGE
 PENINSULA COLLEGE
 PENN HALL JR COLLEGE
 PENSACOLA JR COLLEGE
 PERKINSTN COL MAIN CAMP
 PERRY NORMAL SCHOOL
 PHILLIPS CO CMTY COLLEG
 PHOENIX COLLEGE
 PIEDMONT TECH ED CTR
 PINE MANOR JR COLLEGE
 PITT TECHNICAL INSTITUT
 POINT PARK COLLEGE
 POLK CO TCHRS COLL

POLK JUNIOR COLLEGE
 PORTERVILLE COLLEGE
 PORTLAND CMTY COLLEGE
 POST JR COLLEGE
 POTEAU CMTY COLLEGE
 POTOMAC ST COL OF W VA
 PRAIRIE STATE COLLEGE
 PRATT CMTY JR COLLEGE
 PRENTISS NORM INDUS INS
 PRESENTATION COLLEGE
 PRINCE GEORGES CMTY COL
 PUERTO RICO JR COLLEGE
 QUEEN OF THE APOSTLES C
 QUINCY JR COLLEGE
 QUINSIGAMOND CMTY COLLE
 R MORRIS JC-CORAOPLS
 RACINE KENOSHA COUNTY T
 RAINEY RIVER ST JR COL
 RANDOLPH TECHNICAL INST
 RANGELY COL OF MESA COL
 RANGER COLLEGE
 RBT MORRIS JC-ALL CA
 RCA INSTITUTES INC
 REEDLEY COLLEGE
 REINHARDT COLLEGE
 RHODE ISLAND JR COLLEGE
 RICHLAND TECHNICAL ED C
 RICHMOND TECH INST
 RICKS COLLEGE
 RIO HONDO JUNIOR COLLEG
 RIVERSIDE CITY COLLEGE
 ROBERT MORRIS JR COLLEG
 ROBT MORRIS COL OF CRTH
 ROCHESTER STATE JR COL
 ROCK VALLEY COLLEGE
 ROCKINGHAM CMTY COLLEGE
 ROCKLAND CMTY COLLEGE
 ROGER WILLIAMS COLLEGE
 SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE
 SACRED HEART COLLEGE
 SACRED HEART COLLEGE
 SAINTS JUNIOR COLLEGE
 SALEM TECH VOC CMTY COL
 SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE
 SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY C
 SAN DIEGO CITY COL
 SAN JACINTO COLLEGE
 SAN JOAQUIN DELTA COLLE
 SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE
 SANDHILLS CMTY COLLEGE

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

SANTA ANA COLLEGE	SOUTHWESTERN OREG CMTY C
SANTA BARBARA CITY COL	SOUTHWSTRN MICH CMTY CO
SANTA FE JUNIOR COLLEGE	SPARTANBG CO TECH ED
SANTA MONICA CITY COLLE	SPARTANBURG JR COL
SANTA ROSA JR COLLEGE	SPOKANE CMTY COLL
SAUK COUNTY TEACHERS CO	SPRING GARDEN INSTITUTE
SAUK VALLEY COLLEGE	SPRINGFIELD JR COLLEGE
SAYRE JR COLLEGE	SPRINGFLD TEC CMTY C
SCHILLING INSTITUTE	ST CATHERINE COLLEGE
SCHOOLCRAFT COLLEGE	ST CLAIR CO CMTY COLLEG
SCHREINER INSTITUTE	ST JOHNS COLLEGE
SCOTTSBLUFF COLLEGE	ST JOHNS RIVER JR COLLE
SE IA CMTY COL BURLTN	ST JOSEPH COL OF FLORID
SE IA CMTY COL KEOKUK	ST JOSEPH SEMINARY
SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLE	ST LAWRENCE SEMINARY
SEMINOLE JR COLLEGE	ST MARYS COLLEGE OF MD
SEMINOLE JR COLLEGE	ST MARYS COL OF O FALLO
SHASTA COLLEGE	ST MARYS JR COLLEGE
SHEBOYGAN CO TCHRS COL	ST MARYS JUNIOR COLLEGE
SHELDON JACKSON JR COL	ST PAULS COLLEGE
SHERIDAN COLLEGE	ST PETERSBURG JR COLLEG
SHORELINE COMMUNITY COL	ST PIUS X PREP SEMINARY
SIERRA COLLEGE	ST TECH INST-MEMPHIS
SILVERMINE COLLEGE OF A	ST THOMAS SEMINARY
SINCLAIR CMTY COLLEGE	STATE FAIR CMTY COLL
SKAGIT VALLEY COLLEGE	STEVENS BUSINESS COLLEG
SNEAD JR COLLEGE	STEVENS HENAGER COL OGD
SO CNTRL CMTY COL	STEVNS HENGR COL MAIN C
SO PILGRIM COL	STHWST MISSISSIPPI JR C
SOLANO COLLEGE	STRATFORD COLLEGE
SOMERSET COUNTY COLL	STRAYER JR COLLEGE
SOUTH FLORIDA JR COLLEG	SUE BENNETT COLLEGE
SOUTH GEORGIA COLLEGE	SUFFOLK CMTY COLLEGE
SOUTH PLAINS COLLEGE	SULLINS COLLEGE
SOUTHEASTERN ILLINOIS C	SULLIVAN COUNTY CMTY CO
SOUTHEASTERN CMTY COLLE	SUMTER AREA TCH ED C
SOUTHEASTN CHRISTIAN CO	SUNY AG+TECH DELHI
SOUTHERN BAPTIST COLLEG	SUNY AG+TECH MORRISVLE
SOUTHERN SEM JR COLLEGE	SUNY AG+TECH ALFRED
SOUTHERN UNION ST JR CO	SUNY AG+TECH CANTON
SOUTHESTRN BAPT COLL	SUNY AG+TECH COBLESKILL
SOUTHWEST BAPTIST COLLE	SUNY AG+TECH FARMNGDALE
SOUTHWEST TEXAS JR COL	SUOMI COLLEGE
SOUTHWESTERN UNION COL	SURRY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE	T J HARRIS JR COLLEGE
SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE	TACOMA COMMUNITY COLLEG
SOUTHWESTERN CMTY COLLE	TAFT COLLEGE
SOUTHWESTRN CHRISTIAN C	TALLAHASSEE JR COLLEGE
SOUTHWOOD COLLEGE	TARRANT CO JUNIOR COLLE
SOUTHWST VA CMTY COL	TAYLOR COUNTY TCHRS COL

QUALITY VII INSTITUTIONS (Cont'd)

TECH INST ALAMANCE
 TEMPLE JR COLLEGE
 TEXARKANA COLLEGE
 TEXAS SOUTHMOST COLLEGE
 THAMES VLY ST TECH COL
 THOMAS NELSON CMTY COL
 THORNTON JR COLLEGE
 THREE RIVERS JR COLLEGE
 TMPKNS/CTLND CMTY CL
 TOMBROCK COLLEGE
 TREASURE VALLEY CMTY CO
 TRENTON JR COLLEGE
 TRI-COUNTY TECH ED C
 TRINIDAD STATE JR COLLE
 TRINITY CHRISTIAN COL
 TRITON COLLEGE
 TROCAIRE COLLEGE
 TRUETT MCCONNELL COLLEG
 TYLER JR COLLEGE
 ULSTER COUNTY CMTY COL
 UMPQUA CMTY COLLEGE
 UNION COLLEGE
 URBANA COLLEGE
 UTICA JR COLLEGE
 VALENCIA JR COLLEGE
 VALLEY FORGE MIL JR COL
 VENTURA COLLEGE
 VERMILION ST JR COLLEGE
 VERMONT TECH COLLEGE
 VERNON COUNTY TCHRS COL
 VICTOR VALLEY COLLEGE
 VICTORIA COLLEGE
 VILLA JULIE COLLEGE INC
 VILLA MARIA COL OF BUFF
 VINCENNES UNIVERSITY
 VIRGINIA INTERMONT COL
 VIRGINIA SOUTHERN COLLE
 VIRGINIA WESTERN CMTY C
 VOORHEES COLLEGE
 VOORHEES TECHNICAL INST
 WABASH VALLEY COLLEGE
 WADHAMS HALL SEMINARY
 WALDORF COLLEGE
 WALKER COLLEGE
 WALLA WALLA CMTY COLLEG
 WALSH INST OF ACCOUNTIN
 WARREN WILSON COLLEGE
 WASHINGTON TECH INST

WASHTENAW CMTY COLLEGE
 WATERBURY STATE TECH CO
 WAUBANSEE JR COLLEGE
 WAUSHARA CO TCHR COL
 WAYNE TECHNICAL INST
 WEATHERFORD COLLEGE
 WENATCHEE VALLEY COL
 WENONAH STATE JR COLLEG
 WENTWORTH INSTITUTE
 WENTWORTH MILITARY ACAD
 WESLEY COLLEGE
 WEST VALLEY COLLEGE
 WESTARK JUNIOR COLLEGE
 WESTCHESTER CMTY COLLEG
 WESTERN PIEDMONT CMTY C
 WESTERN WYOMING CMTY CO
 WHARTON COUNTY JR COL
 WILKES COMMUNITY COLLEG
 WILLIAMSPT AREA CMTY CO
 WILLMAR STATE JR COLLEG
 WILSON CO TECH INST
 WINGATE COLLEGE
 WINSTON CHURCHILL COLLE
 WM L YANCEY ST JR COLLE
 WM RANEY HARPER COLLEGE
 WOOD JR COLLEGE
 WORCESTER JR COLLEGE
 WORTHINGTON STATE JR CO
 WW HOLDING TECH INSI
 WYOMING VALLEY TECH INS
 WYTHEVILLE CMTY COLLEGE
 XAVERIAN COLLEGE
 YAKIMA VALLEY COLLEGE
 YORK CO TECH ED CTR
 YORK COLLEGE
 YORK JR COLLEGE
 YOUNG HARRIS COLLEGE
 YUBA COLLEGE